

Ariana Costa

From: bounce@bounce.votervoice.net on behalf of Rose Russell <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2026 10:08 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: H8113 OPPOSED - This proposal raises costs for landlords AND tenants

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

This is incredibly onerous and burdensome.

1 what if the lease starts on a weekend when the bank is closed? Will I be sued for that?

2 I have had tenants who did thousands of dollars more damage than their security deposit. They would not get any deposit back, why should I pay them interest when they have destroyed a home, and need to be held responsible to repay the cost of their damages. It is IMPOSSIBLE to collect money from a destructive tenant.

3 Triple damages plus reasonable court and attorney fees? What if I've calculated everything and it's not correct? Do I get sued? How much do I pay an accountant to do this?

4 The cost to have a bookkeeper administer all of this will raise rents because it costs far more than the measly interest would add up to.

5 How on earth would I be able to do this in an apartment with 4 different housemates who moved in at different times? Administer 12 different accounts for 1 three family house?

6 Banks charge monthly fees for accounts that do not meet a minimum deposit amount, the charges will deplete the security deposit about \$10-\$20 per month which will leave tenants with no security deposit at the end of their lease. This entire bill is preposterous.

The proposed amendment mandating landlords with six or more units to place tenants' deposits into interest-bearing federally insured accounts would substantially increase landlords' administrative responsibilities. This would involve managing separate accounts for each tenant, monitoring interest rates, and ensuring compliance with federal rules. These added duties would raise operating costs, likely resulting in higher rents for tenants, especially affecting smaller landlords who lack the resources to efficiently handle these requirements.

Additionally, the provision to pay out accrued interest to tenants within 20 days after lease termination could pose logistical challenges. Promptly calculating and distributing interest might prove difficult, leading to delays and disputes, which would further escalate administrative costs and potentially rents.

It has been noted that in nearby Massachusetts many landlords have opted out of accepting security deposits due to the amount of liability. Instead of bearing the administrative burden, landlords have opted to instead collect additional rent up front as well as increase rental prices to cover any expense a security deposit may have covered. This is less beneficial to the tenant for two main reasons, first being that a security deposit is refundable but rent is not. The second obvious reason that this unintended consequence of increased rents would come at a time when renters are already most vulnerable. We are in a housing crisis and any drastic, additional increase in rent, would be unfortunate. However, property owners will likely choose to protect their interests and avoid unnecessary costs and litigation.

While the goal of benefiting tenants with accrued interest is acknowledged, the burden imposed on landlords by this amendment could outweigh these advantages. Therefore, I oppose this bill due to its adverse impact on housing affordability.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Rose Russell
26 Dexter St
Providence, RI 02909
rose02903@gmail.com