

## Regarding bills to increase density of communities

Christine ODonnell to dan.graeve@coleg.gov

02/01/2024 02:17 PM

Dear committee members

It appears to me that you are disregarding the opinions of the current community members in your unwavering determination to create "Affordable housing". Rather than focus on more density and more housing why not find out what current communities feel about your objective. In my conversations with neighbors and friends no one wants what you are doing. No one wants more growth. We are already concerned about enough water, enough roads and parking issues why make those issues even more problematic

I don't know why cities and the state are afraid to put it in the ballot and then listen to the citizens

Thank you

Christine ODonnell

80528

**House Transportation, Housing & Local Government**

**01/30/2024 01:30 PM**

**HB24-1098 Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant**

**Typed Text of Testimony Submitted**

<b>Name, Position, Representing</b>	<b>Typed Text of Testimony</b>
Manan Shah Against themselves	<p>The bill is absolutely ridiculous. This bill is a live evidence why people are now hesitant to buy investment properties. Why not rather pass a bill where anybody who needs to rent property/relocate government or the bill proposal helps them out.</p> <p>Being landlord is a business and basically the bill proposes to convert that business into non profit organization. At this point let's just give every Coloradoan free primary homes.</p>



Bill 24-1098 Dave Blazis | PREMIER REAL ESTATE GROUP 02/12/2024 10:36 AM To  
dan.graeve@coleg.gov

**Urgent Action Required: Reject House Bill 24-1098 - Bad for Tenants - Bad for Landlords**

House Bill 24-1098 introduces extreme legislation demanding "cause" for not renewing tenant leases, severely jeopardizing Colorado's rental market. This bill will not only decrease inventory and inflate rental rates through diminished supply but also through dramatically increased attorney and court fees. It's a scenario where everyone loses, except for attorneys who stand to gain from the heightened legal disputes. Key consequences include:

- **Detrimental to Small Investors:** Forces mom-and-pop landlords out, eroding the community fabric of our rental market.
- **Reduction in Rental Inventors:** Leads to fewer housing options as small landlords are compelled to sell or exit the market.
- **Surge in Rental Rates:** Escalating legal fees and operational costs will inevitably lead to higher rents, directly impacting tenants.
- **Unwanted Lease Perpetuation:** Landlords will be trapped in potentially problematic leasing situations, with limited recourse to amicably part ways with tenants.

This legislation is a triple threat: bad for tenants who will face higher rents and fewer choices, bad for landlords who are pushed into cornered operational scenarios, and disproportionately beneficial for attorneys due to the inevitable increase in legal disputes and litigation.

**Immediate Call to Action: Cast a NO vote on HB24-1098.** It's essential to prevent this detrimental impact on Colorado's rental market, ensuring it remains accessible and fair for both tenants and landlords, not just a lucrative battleground for legal professionals.

Dave Blazis  
Premier Real Estate Group  
502 E. Pikes Peak Ave. #200  
Colorado Springs CO 80903  
719-955-5342  
[WWW.RentSprings.com](http://WWW.RentSprings.com)

TO: House Transportation, Housing, and Local Affairs Committee  
From: Elena Santarella, BlueGreen Alliance  
Re: Testimony In Support of HB24-1098 Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant

I am testifying on behalf of the BlueGreen Alliance coalition in support of HB24-1098 Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant. The BlueGreen Alliance is a coalition that unites Colorado's largest labor unions and environmental organizations together to solve environmental challenges while maintaining quality jobs. I want to thank the committee for the opportunity to testify on this important piece of legislation.

The BlueGreen Alliance coalition supports HB24-1098 Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant due to its impact on working class families and role in promoting sustainable communities.

First, this bill represents an important step in protecting the working class from homelessness. Current eviction policies allow women and families with children to be vulnerable to housing instability. HB24-1098 addresses this discrimination by outlining clear reasons that a tenant can be evicted and establishes a timeline to be granted for tenants to find new housing. Without these protections, working class families are left without recourse against a landlord's decision to evict a tenant for no fault of their own and can be left scrambling to find new housing or even facing homelessness. We know that Colorado has a homelessness crisis, and this bill represents an important step in preventing more vulnerable renters from losing their housing.

Second, HB24-1098 has an impact on the state's larger goal to create sustainable communities. In many cases, folks displaced from their housing tend to relocate further from their jobs and other amenities resulting in more vehicle miles traveled. Since the transportation sector represents one of the largest emitters of greenhouse gases, and passenger vehicles represent the largest emitter of that sector, we need policy that will contribute to less vehicle miles traveled. Addressing the displacement occurring to many renters is one step in creating communities that encourage walking, carpooling, and use of public transit. By discouraging the displacement of tenants for no fault of their own, this bill also has an impact on transportation patterns and the dependency on cars that has created the large emitting transportation sector in Colorado.

To conclude, as an advocate for strengthening the middle and working class and creating a more sustainable economy, I support the provisions in this bill that protect low-income families and other vulnerable tenants from eviction. The bill remains an important step in addressing two of Colorado's largest obstacles in creating sustainable communities, homelessness and transportation emissions, all while combatting discrimination in the rental market.

I urge you to support HB24-1098 Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant.

Sincerely,

Elena Santarella  
Colorado Policy Organizer  
BlueGreen Alliance

An open email to the sponsors of HB24-1098, Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant, and the House Transportation, Housing, and Local Government Committee

Hello to all,

My name is Cory Gaines. I am a lifelong Colorado resident.

My wife and I have rented her condo ever since we married and she moved in with me. I helped allow her to stay home with our baby which followed our marriage.

We've been renting it for about 6 years now. We've kept it in good condition (we hope to re-occupy it, or at least have the option in the future, if our incomes allow).

Small wonder that we have had only two different tenants in this last 6 years: we are decent people and work hard to treat others, our tenant included, as we would like to be treated, and we keep the rents low to hold on to good people.

Every year, this state (on top of Denver) adds or seeks to add yet more to the lengthy and complicated list of laws and regulations that landlords must meet. This is on top of a system that is already tilted in favor of tenants.

The impression I (and I'm guessing many other landlords) have is that somehow we have an unlimited capacity, budget, and tolerance for rules. To add insult to injury, the policies are nearly always written with what I would term a "blunt edge". That is, all landlords, regardless of the size of their operation and behavior, are lumped together into a group.

I assure you all that neither of these things are true. Especially for landlords such as my wife and I. Besides the above, I'd like to remind you that we are not professional landlords.

We rent a single residence and face a daunting choice every time a new regulation comes out: we must either take time from our full time jobs to learn and ensure compliance or we must pay someone retail to do the compliance for us.

Eventually, and we get closer to this with every new regulation, regardless of how well written it is, how beneficent its intention, this will become more cost and hassle than its worth and we will cash out the condo for the (large) value it will have to someone.

That is, it will cease to be a rental that is actually decently affordable for the part of Denver it's in.

In a state where the ruling party has said more than once that they are laser focused on affordability and housing, I ask you whether your actions match your words when you make policy such as this.

Policy that increases burdens and costs on landlords. Policy that makes them rethink whether they want to rent or not.

I also ask you whether or not you think your policy is intended to bring people together or divide them. Does it separate groups into oppressors and oppressed or does it foster working together to fix problems?

A reasonable person would not struggle to answer these questions as that your policies work against affordability by making it harder to supply housing and by making people unwilling to risk a legal hassle. This is on top of the implied insult against their character.

I urge a no vote.

Thank you for your time.

C



FW: OPPOSITION TO HB24-1098Bart Rice to: committees.lcs.ga@coleg.gov  
02/14/2024 09:36 AM

## Opposition to the Colorado HB24-1098

The Colorado Governor, Senators and House of Representatives who draft, sponsor and vote for HB24-1098 violate the U S Constitutional Rights of Colorado real property landlords/owners.

The Fifth Amendment protects the right to private property. It states that a person may not be deprived of property by the government without “due process of law,” or fair procedures. Further, the U.S. Constitution provides protection for private property owners when the government intervenes through official regulations restricting an owner's rights in land or housing.

HB24-1098 guts the Statute of Frauds which requires interests in land, namely leases to be in writing to be enforceable. Clearly, if HB24-1098 is enacted it will undermine all leases for property that have been made available by Colorado citizens for the occupancy by tenants, many of whom do not pay their fair share of taxes. Tenants have rights based only upon a minuscule payment of rent to landlords.

What is the Statute of Frauds rule relating to real property?

The Statute of Frauds is a law enacted in all states that requires that certain agreements be in writing and signed by persons against whom enforcement of the contract may be sought. The statute will apply to any transfer of an interest in real estate and to leases with a duration longer than one year.

The Colorado Governor, Senators and House of Representatives who draft, sponsor and vote for HB24-1098 fail in their responsibility to represent their Colorado citizens and constituents as set forth below.

What are some of the job responsibilities of the state legislatures?

From the internet, Colorado legislators have the following responsibilities:

Key Responsibilities	Creates and enacts laws, policies, and regulations; studies proposed legislation; meets with constituents.
----------------------	--

A constituent is defined as a person who lives in and can vote in a constituency.

Public policies are made by the government to address the problems faced by the citizens of the country. Public policies are made by the government to address the problems faced by the citizens of the country.

What are four (4) responsibilities of a citizen? From the internet:

They must....Respect and obey federal, state, and local laws. Respect the rights, beliefs, and opinions of others. Participate in your local community. Pay income and other taxes honestly, and on time, to federal, state, and local authorities.

While landlords/owners regularly pay income taxes, property taxes, capital gains taxes, and depreciation recovery taxes, tenants in many instances pay only income taxes.

Who pays the Colorado Governor, Senators and House of Representatives?  
Owners/landlords or tenants?

Colorado legislators who draft, sponsor and vote for HB24-1098 fail in their responsibility to represent landlords and promote lawlessness.

Bart Rice



RE: OPPOSITION TO HB24-1098Bart Rice to: committees.lcs.ga@coleg.gov  
02/13/2024 11:09 AM

To Committee Members and Colorado House of Representatives.

RE: OPPOSITION TO HB24-1098

We own five rental houses that were bought some years ago to provide income during our retirement since Social Security is so meager. Since 2021 and the Governor allowance of tenant breaches in lease obligations, we have suffered over \$60,000 in damages, losses, repairs, and rehab replacements by four separate tenants.

We have been unable to collect even a dollar from any of the four wrongdoing tenants who in all cases abandoned their occupied property with no notice, leaving terrible damages.

We provide housing for tenants who do not have the funds or credit to buy property.

We pay income taxes, capital gains taxes, real estate taxes, and must pay depreciation recapture if we sell.

Why should we as elderly citizens of Colorado be required to suffer at the hands of tenants who are encouraged to breach lease obligations which for years had been followed? Isn't HB-1098 elder abuse by the government?

Bart Rice

---

**From:** Bart Rice  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 13, 2024 10:25 AM  
**To:** Stacy Winn <stacy@galvanandgardner.com>  
**Cc:** Bart Rice <bart@mywiseword.com>; Rice, Bart-Sheri <sbjbart@yahoo.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Property Management

Good day Stacy,

My question is about the Leasing Commission/Fee for getting a new tenant.

The Management Agreement only states a 11% figure for a Leasing Commission/Fee.

Is the 11% calculated on a month's rent or the total amount of lease?

Thanks  
Bart Rice  
Manager, CMIC, LLC

---

**From:** Stacy Winn  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 13, 2024 9:46 AM  
**To:** Bart Rice <[bart@mywiseword.com](mailto:bart@mywiseword.com)>  
**Cc:** Rice, Bart-Sheri <[sbjbart@yahoo.com](mailto:sbjbart@yahoo.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: Property Management

Good morning Sir!

The management fee is 11% of a month's rent.

Each month when we collect rent from the tenant, we will deduct the 11% fee and any other deductions (for example property repair invoices), and then forward you the difference.

Kind regards,

On Tue, Feb 13, 2024 at 9:42 AM Bart Rice <[bart@mywiseword.com](mailto:bart@mywiseword.com)> wrote:

Good day Stacy,

Could you clarify the Leasing Fee in the Management Agreement?

The Agreement states 11% for a leasing fee...is that 11% of a month's rent...or 11% of the total lease amount?

Thanks  
Bart Rice  
Manager, CMIC, LLC

---

**From:** Stacy Winn  
**Sent:** Monday, February 12, 2024 10:59 AM  
**To:** Bart Rice <[bart@mywiseword.com](mailto:bart@mywiseword.com)>  
**Subject:** Property Management

Hello Sir,

Thank you for speaking with me today about managing your properties. Please see the attached blank management contract.

Please let us know if you have any questions!

Thank you!

--

***Stacy Winn***  
**Bookkeeper**  
**Galvan and Gardner Real Estate Group, Inc.**  
913 So. 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Colorado Springs, CO 80905  
(719) 301-2222/3333 Office  
[www.GalvanandGardner.com](http://www.GalvanandGardner.com)

--

***Stacy Winn***  
**Bookkeeper**

**Galvan and Gardner Real Estate Group, Inc.**

913 So. 8<sup>th</sup> Street

Colorado Springs, CO 80905

(719) 301-2222/3333 Office

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

## HB24 - 1098 FOR CAUSE EVICTION BILL

As a landlord that deals with numerous short and mid-term rentals, to travel nurses, medical professionals, college interns and military personal in need of midterm housing for 1 to 3 months, HB24 – 1098 would end up reducing both the affordability and availability of this much-needed midterm housing option.

HB24 - 1098 would not allow us to:

1. To do one- or two-month leases (midterm leases), due to the 90-day notice requirement. So these travel nurses, college interns, etc., would be forced into doing multiple short term rentals and possibly have to move every 28 or 29 days. They would more than likely have to pay higher daily rates plus pay sales and lodging taxes. In Colorado Springs that would add an additional 10.25 percent tax on top of the daily rental rates. *Note: there are no sales or lodging taxes on rentals longer than 30 days in El Paso County.*
2. As a landlord we would have higher administrative costs and a greater risk of vacancy loss between rentals, which in turn would lead to higher daily rates, and reduced affordability.
3. We would NOT be able to advertise these apartments months in advance like we currently do. We would have to wait until we received the 30-day notice to vacate from the tenant BEFORE we can start advertising the apartment as available. Many interns and travel nurses are looking up to 6 or 7 months in advance and want to be able to know if they can secure a place to live before accepting an assignment or internship.
4. We also do 9-month leases for students at Colorado College, here again HB24 will affect our ability to advertise 6 months or more in advance. So, they might have to sign a 12-month lease, even if they are only going to be there for 9 months, which greatly increases their housing costs. Or they will have to wait until midsummer to see if that apartment becomes available. Again, increasing the costs to the tenants while also reducing the availability.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely

Frank Hibbitts  
Hibbitts Family LLC  
5570 Simple Way,  
Colorado Springs, CO 80919  
719-237-1482



February 9, 2023

**RE: HB24-1098 Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant - SUPPORT**

Dear Members of the House Transportation, Housing & Local Government Committee:

**I am testifying in support of HB24-1098, on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Colorado.**

The League of Women Voters of Colorado (LWVCO) has been a nonpartisan organization for 104 years, encourages informed and active participation in government, and influences public policy through education and advocacy. Our membership spans the state of Colorado with 19 local leagues operating in many regions around the state.

The LWVCO supports policies to provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for every person. Our Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) values are served when local communities and their governmental authorities can adopt regulations that benefit their communities.

Rent prices have soared in Colorado and many Coloradans are severely burdened by their housing rental costs. There are over 700,000 renter households in Colorado cities alone, which represents 34% of all households in Colorado. Many families are choosing to move out of state rather than continue to work and live here, where housing is often not attainable in today's market, for renting or buying. Evictions have surged in the past year, to over 10,000 filings for evictions alone. HB24-1098 aims to reduce this statistic and provide more equity in an unbalance power dynamic for renters.

HB24-1098 provides changes to the Colorado Revised Statutes to reduce the number of evictions, sudden and otherwise, that are without cause, other than increasing rents as new tenants move in. It provides definitions for "for cause" and "no fault" evictions under which landlords must provide adequate notice, no matter the length of time the tenant has occupied their rental. This provision assists tenants who need to relocate more time in this incredibly difficult market to find new lodging. The "for cause" provisions allow an eviction where rent has not been paid or the renter(s) will not surrender possession of the premises. Additionally, "no fault" evictions are allowed in a number of circumstances, for instance when the landlord or a family member wants to occupy the residence or needs to do substantial repairs or upgrades. Unhoused populations surveyed in Denver report that increases in rent or notice to vacate (evictions or otherwise) are the #2 and #3 causes of experiencing homelessness.

We urge the committee members to vote **YES** on **HB24-1098**. Thank you for your consideration of this important bill.

Respectfully,  
Kate van Houten, Volunteer Lobbyist - Housing  
League of Women Voters of Colorado  
1410 Grant Street, Suite B-204  
Denver, CO 80203  
303-863-0437



February 9, 2023

**RE: HB24-1098 Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant - SUPPORT**

Dear Members of the House Transportation, Housing & Local Government Committee:

**I am testifying in support of HB24-1098, on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Colorado.**

The League of Women Voters of Colorado (LWVCO) has been a nonpartisan organization for 104 years, encourages informed and active participation in government, and influences public policy through education and advocacy. Our membership spans the state of Colorado with 19 local leagues operating in many regions around the state.

The LWVCO supports policies to provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for every person. Our Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) values are served when local communities and their governmental authorities can adopt regulations that benefit their communities.

Rent prices have soared in Colorado and many Coloradans are severely burdened by their housing rental costs. There are over 700,000 renter households in Colorado cities alone, which represents 34% of all households in Colorado. Many families are choosing to move out of state rather than continue to work and live here, where housing is often not attainable in today's market, for renting or buying. Evictions have surged in the past year, to over 10,000 filings for evictions alone. HB24-1098 aims to reduce this statistic and provide more equity in an unbalance power dynamic for renters.

HB24-1098 provides changes to the Colorado Revised Statutes to reduce the number of evictions, sudden and otherwise, that are without cause, other than increasing rents as new tenants move in. It provides definitions for "for cause" and "no fault" evictions under which landlords must provide adequate notice, no matter the length of time the tenant has occupied their rental. This provision assists tenants who need to relocate more time in this incredibly difficult market to find new lodging. The "for cause" provisions allow an eviction where rent has not been paid or the renter(s) will not surrender possession of the premises. Additionally, "no fault" evictions are allowed in a number of circumstances, for instance when the landlord or a family member wants to occupy the residence or needs to do substantial repairs or upgrades. Unhoused populations surveyed in Denver report that increases in rent or notice to vacate (evictions or otherwise) are the #2 and #3 causes of experiencing homelessness.

We urge the committee members to vote **YES** on **HB24-1098**. Thank you for your consideration of this important bill.

Respectfully,  
Kate van Houten, Volunteer Lobbyist - Housing  
League of Women Voters of Colorado  
1410 Grant Street, Suite B-204  
Denver, CO 80203  
303-863-0437

Re: opposition to HB 24-1098

Date 2/10/24

From: John McEncroe, 2315 Table Heights Drive, Golden CO 80401, [jmcencroe@msn.com](mailto:jmcencroe@msn.com)

I began working in 1965 when I was 14 yrs. old. and worked until June 2024 (59 years). During the majority of that time I supervised water and/or wastewater treatment plants. My salary was usually based on averaging 50 hours/week, and I was typically on-call 24/7/365, without additional compensation when I responded to the treatment facility to ensure the production of potable water, or the proper treatment of wastewater before discharge to Colorado waters.

My wife Carol began working in 1971, and worked for over 30 years as a Teacher. She typically put in 60 hours/week during the school year as a Kindergarten/1<sup>st</sup> grade teacher; she spent a significant amount of her evenings and week-ends developing lesson plans, projects, and manipulatives, for the classroom. Although she wanted to continue teaching, she had to retire from teaching in 2022 (after working 51 years) due to profound hearing loss.

Many years ago, Social Security advised us to not rely on Social Security to meet our financial needs in retirement. As such, while working our regular jobs, we designed and built two houses from the ground up, and remodeled 3 houses. We used the proceeds from construction/remodeling to purchase two rental condos to supplement our retirement benefits. We now rely upon the income from our two rental condos to make up the difference between our retirement benefits, and our actual financial needs.

During the COVID pandemic the government mandated that landlords could not evict tenants for non-payment of rent, yet tenants were not required to show economic hardship or need. And although the government had our tax returns which clearly showed what our fixed costs on the properties have historically been, there was no offer by the government to cover our fixed costs for tenants choosing to not pay rent. The assumption by the government must have been that if someone can afford a rental property, that someone (the landlord), can afford to let people live in a property rent free. Although our hearts went out for those who couldn't pay their rent, the government should have, at a minimum, compensated us for our fixed costs. Yet, we, nor any landlords we know, ever received any compensation from any governmental agency to cover any of our fixed costs.

HB 23-1171 was similar to HB 24-1098, and would have required "Just Cause for Eviction" (technically a nonrenewal of lease, not an eviction) of a tenant from a residential premise. By limiting a landlord's ability to not renew a lease (except for reasons spelled out in the bill, and by repealing the current law regarding notices to vacate), HB23-1171 would have created an untenable financial situation where offering a tenant a lease of any term would require the payment of 3 months rent to the tenant in the event of lease non-renewal.

Please vote against HB 24-1098; it erodes the incentive to work hard, and to scrimp and save, in order to be self-reliant in retirement.

Sincerely,

John (and Carol) McEncroe  
2315 Table Heights Drive  
Golden, CO 80401

Ps to Rep. Duran: As you sponsored HB 23-1171, as well as HB 24-1098, you need to know that I was a cook when I married Carol in 1976. I did not have the funds to replace the starter on my Fiat 850 and had to push start it for an entire winter (after getting off work at ~11:30 PM). I am not oblivious to hardship; however, am fed up with those in government whose actions indicate a presumption that anyone who has something of value hasn't worked for it, and doesn't deserve it.

## HB24-1098 - Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant

This Bill is completely iniquitous, being as it compels landlords to renew a lease, but places no similar constraints on tenants. Effectively this Bill renders the lease expiry date moot, since in practical terms the landlord has no choice but to allow the tenants to remain in possession of the property for as long as they wish, unless they give the landlord cause to evict.

No other contract operates in such a fashion!

Contracts usually have set terms, including a start date and a termination date. All signatories to the contract should be aware of the terms before signing. How can anyone suggest that one party to the contract should have the right to ignore the terms of the contract, while the other party has to compensate the first party in order to enforce the said terms?

This Bill is specifically designed to violate the landlord's right to have their property returned at the end of the lease, placing the full responsibility on the landlord to show just cause for enforcing the agreed-upon termination date, requiring the landlord to give up to four months' notice of said enforcement, and demanding that the landlord compensate the tenant for said enforcement! This is utterly preposterous: no-one could possibly consider such a one-sided distortion of contract law to be fair or reasonable!

This Bill will effectively outlaw month-to-month leases, or any lease term less than four months. It means when I sign a new lease agreement, I am committed to an unknown lease term, I have no idea when I will ever get my house back. This will be completely unacceptable and will almost certainly result in a very significant drop in the availability of rental properties as landlords switch to less risky investments.

One last point I feel I should make: a landlord's ability to elect not to renew a tenant's lease is a key tool in the rental property market. It provides a mid-way measure between good tenants, and seriously bad tenants. For example, we currently have a tenant who frequently keeps a dog in the house in violation of the lease, which clearly states "No Pets". The dog is allowed to roam freely, off-leash, and defecates anywhere it chooses, in violation of the community covenants. We have received complaints from the neighbors and the HOA, and we have addressed these with the tenant, all to no avail. This is a classic example of a situation where we will opt not to renew the lease. The violations are not as severe or urgent as to require eviction, but we have to be seen to be acting as responsible landlords in the eyes of the community. And the tenant needs to learn that there are consequences for such irresponsible behavior.

Who knows, perhaps she will treat her next landlord with more respect!

Sincerely,  
Phuong Tran

## HB24-1098 - Cause Required for Eviction of Residential Tenant

This Bill is completely iniquitous, being as it compels landlords to renew a lease, but places no similar constraints on tenants. Effectively this Bill renders the lease expiry date moot, since in practical terms the landlord has no choice but to allow the tenants to remain in possession of the property for as long as they wish, unless they give the landlord cause to evict.

No other contract operates in such a fashion!

Contracts usually have set terms, including a start date and a termination date. All signatories to the contract should be aware of the terms before signing. How can anyone suggest that one party to the contract should have the right to ignore the terms of the contract, while the other party has to compensate the first party in order to enforce the said terms?

This Bill is specifically designed to violate the landlord's right to have their property returned at the end of the lease, placing the full responsibility on the landlord to show just cause for enforcing the agreed-upon termination date, requiring the landlord to give up to four months' notice of said enforcement, and demanding that the landlord compensate the tenant for said enforcement! This is utterly preposterous: no-one could possibly consider such a one-sided distortion of contract law to be fair or reasonable!

This Bill will effectively outlaw month-to-month leases, or any lease term less than four months. It means when I sign a new lease agreement, I am committed to an unknown lease term, I have no idea when I will ever get my house back. This will be completely unacceptable and will almost certainly result in a very significant drop in the availability of rental properties as landlords switch to less risky investments.

One last point I feel I should make: a landlord's ability to elect not to renew a tenant's lease is a key tool in the rental property market. It provides a mid-way measure between good tenants, and seriously bad tenants. For example, we currently have a tenant who frequently keeps a dog in the house in violation of the lease, which clearly states "No Pets". The dog is allowed to roam freely, off-leash, and defecates anywhere it chooses, in violation of the community covenants. We have received complaints from the neighbors and the HOA, and we have addressed these with the tenant, all to no avail. This is a classic example of a situation where we will opt not to renew the lease. The violations are not as severe or urgent as to require eviction, but we have to be seen to be acting as responsible landlords in the eyes of the community. And the tenant needs to learn that there are consequences for such irresponsible behavior.

Who knows, perhaps she will treat her next landlord with more respect!

Sincerely,  
Eric A. Mayne

**HB24-1098 written public testimony**

**Dan Graeve** to Dan Graeve

01/29/2024 01:44 PM



**Dan Graeve | MPA**

Policy and Research Analyst  
Legislative Council Staff

**Direct:** 303-866-3446 | **LCS Main:** 303-866-3521

**Email:** dan.graeve@coleg.gov

200 East Colfax Ave, Suite 029, Denver CO 80203

----- Forwarded by Dan Graeve/CLICS on 01/29/2024 01:44 PM -----

From: "Rosalie" <rosalie@abundanceps.com>  
To: <dan.graeve@coleg.gov>  
Date: 01/26/2024 05:05 PM  
Subject: HB24-1098

Please vote no on the above house bill. It would be detrimental to landlords perhaps causing many of them to no longer rent their properties.

**Rosalie Dorland**

Abundance Property Services, Inc

355 S. Teller Street, Suite 200

Lakewood, CO 80226-7391

Office: 303-233-7558

Cell: 303-919-8755

Fax: 303-233-3454

[rosalie@abundanceps.com](mailto:rosalie@abundanceps.com)

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

----- Forwarded by Dan Graeve/CLICS on 01/29/2024 01:44 PM -----

From: "Lisa Wiles" <gilwiles@aol.com>  
To: "LISA GILMAN WILES" <gilwiles@aol.com>  
Date: 01/27/2024 03:31 PM  
Subject: HB 24-1098 "Good Cause" Legislation

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am very concerned about the harm this bill poses to property owner, tenants, and the entire housing industry throughout Colorado and specifically Colorado Springs. This bill greatly hinders the rights of the small property owners, who make up a large percentage of the rental

market properties that are available. This bill is onerous and restrictive to "mom and pop" landlords. We are not California, and do not have California issues, so why mimic bad California legislation?

- This bill mandates endless leases.
- Rental agreements have an agreed upon time frame. The owner must maintain the right to have the property back at the end of the lease, otherwise the transaction is effectively a sale.
- Sales of property can and do happen, but it is much more expensive to buy a property than to rent it. Rental transactions exist so the people who don't want or can't afford the cost of buying a property can still live in it for an agreed-upon length of time.
- The median sales price for a Colorado home is \$527,000. The median rent is \$1,810. That is the difference in cost from acquiring a property permanently or acquiring it for a shorter agreed-upon time.
- This bill would prohibit month-to-month leases and 2-month leases with its requirement of at least 90-day notice of termination.
- Two month's rent as compensation for moving the rich and three month's rent to lower income resident's is a financial burden that will drive up rent rates for everyone. A one-year lease that requires the repayment of 3 months' rent at termination (15 months for the price of 12) requires 25% higher rent to be financially neutral to the housing provider.
- Because of the 90-day notice requirement the shortest increment of time a housing unit could be rented would be 3 months.
- This bill eliminates the legal ability to terminate a lease for any behavioral violations which are known but not provable pitting neighboring renters against each other in court.
- This bill impossibly confuses notice requirements with different lengths of notices required based on the occupant's age, income level and disability status (any of which may not be known to the housing provider).
- If you don't preserve the method for people to get their property back at the expiration of a contract, they will be discouraged from renting it out to begin with.
- This bill hurts residents who will have to endure unreasonable disturbances by neighbors with no legal remedy for the housing provider to resolve the problem.
- Any financial decision to engage in a one-year lease will have to be priced to generate 3 extra months' rent to cover the mandatory rent penalty for termination.
- Colorado statute already prohibits non-renewal based on:
  - maintenance complaints (CRS 38-12-509)

· All protected classifications under State and Federal Fair Housing Laws (CRS 24-34-502 Title VIII of the Civil Rights act of 1968)

I urge you to reject this harmful legislation. I thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lisa Wiles

----- Forwarded by Dan Graeve/CLICS on 01/29/2024 01:44 PM -----

From: "Leslie Galbreath" <galbreath.leslie@gmail.com>  
To: dan.graeve@coleg.gov  
Date: 01/27/2024 03:59 PM  
Subject: HB24-1098

---

Dear House Transportation & Local Government Committee:

Please oppose HB24-1098.

I am a retired public servant of over 30+ years who has a small investment condominium. This is a significant and critical component of my retirement portfolio. I am very fair with and take very good care of my tenants.

Colorado already has strong tenant protections in place. This is unnecessary and dangerous legislation.

Thank you for your time,

Dr. Leslie Galbreath  
25342 E. Indore Dr, Aurora

----- Forwarded by Dan Graeve/CLICS on 01/29/2024 01:44 PM -----

From: "Bob Sully" <malibyte56@gmail.com>  
To: tony.exum.senate@coleg.gov, regina.english.house@coleg.gov, scott.bottoms.house@coleg.gov, larry.liston.senate@coleg.gov, tisha.mauro.house@coleg.gov, javier.mabrey.house@coleg.gov, ken.degraaf.house@coleg.gov, marc.snyder.house@coleg.gov, dan.graeve@coleg.gov, meg.froelich.house@coleg.gov, monica.duran.house@coleg.gov, julie.gonzales.senate@coleg.gov, stephanie.vigil.house@coleg.gov, mandy.lindsay.house@coleg.gov, jennifer.parenti.house@coleg.gov, marc.catlin.house@coleg.gov, andrew.boesenecker.house@coleg.gov, don.wilson.house@coleg.gov, iman.jodeh.house@coleg.gov, alex.valdez.house@coleg.gov  
Date: 01/28/2024 06:27 PM  
Subject: HB 14-1098 "Good Cause" Legislation

---

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am very concerned about the harm this bill poses to property owners, tenants, and the entire housing industry throughout Colorado and specifically Colorado Springs. This bill greatly hinders the rights of the small property owners, who make up a large percentage of the rental market properties that are available. This bill is onerous and restrictive to "mom and pop" landlords. We are not California, and do not have California issues, so why mimic bad

## California legislation?

- This bill mandates endless leases.
- Rental agreements have an agreed upon time frame. The owner must maintain the right to have the property back at the end of the lease, otherwise the transaction is effectively a sale.
- Sales of property can and do happen, but it is much more expensive to buy a property than to rent it. Rental transactions exist so the people who don't want or can't afford the cost of buying a property can still live in it for an agreed-upon length of time.
- The median sales price for a Colorado home is \$527,000. The median rent is \$1,810. That is the difference in cost from acquiring a property permanently or acquiring it for a shorter agreed-upon time.
- This bill would prohibit month-to-month leases and 2-month leases with its requirement of at least 90-day notice of termination.
- Two months' rent as compensation for moving the rich and three months' rent to lower income residents is a financial burden that will drive up rent rates for everyone. A one-year lease that requires the repayment of 3 months' rent at termination (15 months for the price of 12) requires 25% higher rent to be financially neutral to the housing provider.
- Because of the 90-day notice requirement the shortest increment of time a housing unit could be rented would be 3 months.
- This bill eliminates the legal ability to terminate a lease for any behavioral violations which are known but not provable pitting neighboring renters against each other in court.
- This bill impossibly confuses notice requirements with different lengths of notices required based on the occupant's age, income level and disability status (any of which may not be known to the housing provider).
- **If you don't preserve the method for people to get their property back at the expiration of a contract, they will be discouraged from renting it out to begin with.**
- This bill hurts neighboring residents who will have to endure unreasonable disturbances by tenants with no legal remedy for the housing provider to resolve the problem.
- Any financial decision to engage in a one-year lease will have to be priced to generate 3 extra months' rent to cover the mandatory rent penalty for termination.
- Colorado statute already prohibits non-renewal based on:
  - maintenance complaints (CRS 38-12-509)
  - All protected classifications under State and Federal Fair Housing Laws (CRS

24-34-502 Title VIII of the Civil Rights act of 1968)

I urge you to reject this harmful legislation. I thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Bob Sully

---

**Bob Sully**

Sent via mobile phone

----- Forwarded by Dan Graeve/CLICS on 01/29/2024 01:44 PM -----

From: "BRENT STEEVES" <brentsteeves@icloud.com>  
To: dan.graeve@coleg.gov  
Date: 01/29/2024 11:53 AM  
Subject: HB 24-109

---

Good morning as a taxpayer in Colorado Springs, I am reaching out to you to let you know that I rent my mother's house out to help with her care as she has dementia.

I have been a landlord since 2018 when she got diagnosed and I moved her into an assisted living. I rented her house out since that time to take care of her medical bills and to pay her mortgage.

I am not running this for profit. I am running this to maintain my mother's lifestyle and assisted-living.

I have been a good landlord. During Covid my tenants missed a few dates and I work with them whenever they say something needs to be repaired or fixed in the home it is done. I have been upgrading things at the home as well since 2018 for the tenants.

But if you pass this, Bill, HB 24-1098 giving more rights to renters than to the property owner. All you'll be doing is forcing me to end my lease with my tenant at the end of their term and returning the home as a private property.

I don't understand why you guys allow this law from the 1800s so that if I had an empty people can squat in it and pretend that they are renters when they are not. And then I have to get legal representation to get them out like I did at my grandmother's house.

Now you want to pass this bill which restricts landlords from their rights. And sadly all you're really going to do is cause people like myself to no longer rent their property out shrinking the available properties for renters to secure..

I hope that you will speak to your colleagues that brought this bill to the floor and let them know that this will not help renters, but will shrink the available housing in an already tight market.

I do not want to lease with my tenants. They've been great all this time but you would be forcing me to change that. Please reconsider this bill.

Brent Steeves

818-458-3685

Sent from my iPad Sent from my iPad



To whom it may concern

Regarding proposed bill HB24-1098

My name is James Kitchens. I own a small property management company in Douglas County. I wanted to reach out and express my concerns to you regarding proposed bill HB24-1098. This bill, along with many other bills around housing in Colorado, is very concerning to myself as a real estate professional, as well as the clients that I have a fiduciary responsibility to represent.

I feel like landlords in general have a bad reputation for being unfair to tenants and that inaccurate representation is what is causing many of these bills to be very one-sided and frankly should cause concern to both landlords and tenants in Colorado. The fact of the matter is a vast majority of landlords in our state are not wealthy companies that can afford these types of changes and laws but are regular people just like you and I that are trying and struggling to build a future for themselves.

My company manages about 50 properties right now in Douglas County. Of those 50 properties, 48 of them are owned by an individual investor or couple that has 1 investment property. They have mortgages on these homes, many of which are higher than the fair market rent amount. The other two properties are owned by a client of mine that lives out of state. That client owns 2 investment properties, both of which are managed by my company.

These aren't corporations... They are regular people with jobs and monthly bills and expenses. Many of them are in our military and rent their property out while they are deployed. In these rental properties that I manage are about 75 tenants. I pride myself on fair treatment to every person I work with through my business. This includes my clients (landlords) and my tenants. This can be seen through my company reviews that I have accumulated over the last 7 years. Both clients and tenants have left me reviews indicating that they had a great experience.

The reason I tell you this is because of my concern for both groups of people. The proposed bill will make a great majority of my clients unable to financially keep their rental in the event they need to pay to support a tenant that doesn't want to leave. It's unreasonable and unrealistic to expect these everyday people to pay up to 3 months rent to relocate a tenant. They don't get assistance for their mortgage. They don't collect money from someone else when they need to move, and they shouldn't be expected to do so for someone else. Additionally, they worked very hard and spent a lot of time and money to acquire these rentals and are now having the government dictate how they operate that property. Unfortunately, the law makers that are putting these bills together don't have real world experience on how these bills will affect everyone. The implications will be negative for everyone involved.

I have already had many clients tell me they will sell their property if this bill passes. When many landlords start selling their rentals because the financial risk isn't worth the reward it's going to drive up rental costs due to supply and demand. Landlords that can afford to do this will simply raise rents to offset the risk involved with owning a rental. This bill is bad for everyone involved.

The majority of landlords are good, decent people struggling to get by. Don't punish the everyone because of the 2% or less of landlords that are treating tenants poorly.

Not only do I encourage you to vote no on this bill, but I think it should be mandatory to reach out to real estate professionals when putting bills like this together. Utilize the people that have experience and knowledge around these decisions. The same people that voted you into office can help you build laws that are fair to both landlords and tenants. Please feel free to reach out to me anytime if you would like my opinion and I know most other real estate professionals would agree to assist with these things as well.

Thank you for your time.

James Kitchens, PMI Parker, (720)773-7368



House Bill 24-1098 Matt Malinski to dan.graeve@coleg.gov 02/03/2024 12:21 PM

Dear Staff,

*PLEASE vote NO on House Bill 24-1098, Requiring “Just Cause” for the Eviction (technically a nonrenewal, not an eviction) of a Tenant from a Residential Premises. This bill would be detrimental to the rental market in Colorado and the single-family rental market especially. This bill will drive away small investors, reduce rental inventory, and place an undue burden on mom-and-pop property owners who wish to amicably separate from a problem tenant when the lease expires. The bill does that in the following ways:*

*By limiting our ability to non-renew tenants/leases for reasons except those spelt out, this bill creates an untenable situation where offering a tenant a lease of any term creates a perpetual lease.*

*Imagine taking over a property with a tenant in place and not being permitted to ask the tenant to leave when their lease expires. While some common reasons for ending a lease are in the bill (such as selling the home or moving back in), there are other reasons that landlords may not wish to continue the relationship, which is not represented. If, for example, you have a hostile tenant, who isn't technically violating the contract in a way that would permit eviction, this bill would force you to continue renting your home to them.*

*Furthermore, imagine not being allowed to have an inherited tenant sign your lease at the time of renewal because the contract must be “substantially identical.” Maybe you are a property manager who took the property into management from a peer, or you are an investor who inherited an existing tenant/lease. This bill would stop you from converting the tenant to your contract, creating an almost impossible situation where you must operate under the terms of another person or entity.*

*Additionally, the language in the bill not only requires a new lease to be substantially identical to the prior lease (ex: pg 10 line 25), but the renewal rate must be “reasonable.” This would function as an unofficial rent-control provision imposed on landlords in Colorado.*

*None of us want a world where corporate entities own all rentals, but that is our future if small landlords are chased out of the market. We do not want our state to become so landlord-adverse that mom-and-mom investors have no choice but to sell, plummeting inventory, and causing more upward pressure on rental rates.*

Dear Committee Members,

February 14, 2024

You are hurting small landlords with HB24-1098. Please vote NO. I am a retired Air Force non-commissioned officer (enlisted) who served our country for 22 years. I am also a small landlord that operates a few rental properties. My wife and I started out with nothing at age 20. We worked hard over the years to diligently save our money month after month. After many years of our dedicated savings efforts, we were able to buy rental property when the opportunity arose.

We have mortgages, and recently much higher property taxes and insurance costs not to mention high costs to operate and maintain property. Actions from the Colorado Legislature regarding landlord / tenant laws are going way too far, and you are taking away property owner rights and hurting the little guy like me.

I rarely have tenant issues. Tenants are my partner in my success. I want tenants I can work with, are responsible, can follow rules, and pay rent on time. I want long term tenants and tenants that renew their lease each year because it saves me money. I treat them well. But at times landlords and especially small landlords need tools to remove tenants when they violate the terms of the lease contract for non-compliance or are displaying behavior that is not appropriate to neighbors, landlords and property management staff. Simply put, there are times it is in the best interest of a landlord to not renew a lease at the end of the term. For example:

1. A tenant is a constant late payer.
2. A tenant is belligerent or aggressive towards the landlord, property manager or neighbors.
3. A tenant that is a constant disruption or causes problems with neighbors.
4. A tenant that does not follow the terms / rules of the lease with pets, constant barking dogs, parking, trash, cleanliness, care of the property, property damage.
5. Noise complaints.
6. Police being called for crime or domestic issues.
7. Creating unsafe conditions for children.

Tenants do need rights and they do; I am all for that. But, look where our society is today because of a lack of accountability? Bad actions and bad behavior cannot be tolerated and must have consequences for those bad actions. If you run a business, would you tolerate such actions from people you work with? OR what if one of your staff members displayed behavior described above towards you or your office, would you tolerate it? Would they have the Right to not be fired? NO, because you have tools to effectively deal with these situations. The same applies to landlords, we need effective tools as well.

More importantly, if you lived next to a person that was a constant problem, would you enjoy continuing to live in that situation? Your quality of life would be drastically diminished. That is why you need to rethink HB24-1098 and vote NO. Landlords must have rights to NOT do business with tenants that can't follow rules or violate the terms of a lease contract. Voting NO is the right thing to do because you as a neighbor living next to irresponsible people would appreciate it too.

Thank you for your consideration and for the little guy who does the right thing as a landlord, and for reading my letter.

Sincerely,



David Cherry  
Larkspur, CO  
719-330-1958

**PLEASE REJECT "GOOD CAUSE" LEGISLATION**

**Mariana Harasawa** to dan.graeve

02/01/2024 10:44 AM

---

Dear Mr. Graeve,

I am incredibly disturbed about the possibility of the "Good Cause" legislation to get approved. I do believe this bill will strip all property rights from landlords disrupting the whole housing market.

With this very unfair legislation, landlords will end up with no rights to continue providing housing to tenants. As it gets more costly and more bureaucracy is added to landlords, price will have to be repassed to the tenants who will at the end have to pay more. That means housing industry will be less affordable.

I really hope we could see some future in the housing market vs destroying it.  
Sincerely,

Mariana Harasawa