

**Roberta DiMezza**

---

**From:** Kellie Marcil <user@votervoice.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 16, 2025 1:29 PM  
**To:** House Judiciary Committee  
**Subject:** OPPOSE H5127

Dear Committee Clerk DiMezza,

For me, this is straightforward: the government shouldn't interfere too much in how I manage my business. I pay taxes, provide a safe and clean environment for my tenants, and keep communication open with them. To be honest, I rarely raise security deposits to match rent increases. A great example is a tenant who stayed with me for 15 years. Although his rent went up over time, I never increased his security deposit. When he moved out, the deposit was much lower than it should have been. But I understood his situation and knew he couldn't afford both a rent hike and a deposit increase, so we came to an agreement that worked for both of us. Sure, when he left, the security deposit didn't cover the cost of repairs, but I took care of it. This level of understanding and cooperation is how it should be between housing providers and tenants.

I am opposed to House Bill 5127 which automatically allows tenants to pay an increase in their security deposit over a period of 12 months.

Typically rent increases are done in very small amounts, such as \$25 or \$50. Spreading such a small amount into 1/12 increments and then having to track such small progress payments over a year would be an undue burden on housing providers.

Further, if the tenant moves out in six months the landlord would never have received the full security deposit equal to one month's rent, leaving them less than one month's rent to pay for any damages, which is not fair to landlords.

Landlords and tenants should be free to negotiate payment arrangements for increased security deposits without it being mandated by statute.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kellie Marcil  
25 ARGYLE AVE APT RANGE  
RIVERSIDE, RI 02915  
svsrealty1@gmail.com