

# Enhancing Low-Income Housing Accessibility in Kansas City, Missouri

January 20, 2024

## Introduction

In response to the challenges facing low-income tenants, particularly black women, in finding suitable housing in Kansas City, Missouri, this proposal suggests alternative strategies to the Source of Income (SOI) Ordinance. Our approach recognizes the unique barriers faced by low-income tenants and aims to create more inclusive and effective solutions.

### Challenges of the SOI Ordinance

While the SOI Ordinance is well-intentioned, aiming to reduce what some of council feels to be income-based discrimination, it inadvertently creates several challenges:

- **Increased Burden on Housing Providers:** The ordinance imposes additional administrative and regulatory burdens on housing providers.
- **Reduced Incentive for Small Investors:** Small-scale landlords may be discouraged from participating in the housing market, reducing available housing stock.
- **Increased Costs:** Compliance with the ordinance will lead to increased operational costs, which could be passed on to tenants, exacerbating affordability issues.

### Proposed Alternatives

To better support low-income housing tenants, we propose the following initiatives:

1. **Shared Risk Rental Assistance Program:** Establish a program where the city provides rent coverage for a set period, incentivizing landlords to take higher-risk tenants.
2. **Downpayment Assistance Fund:** Create a fund to assist renters in transitioning to homeownership, enhancing long-term financial stability.
3. **Financial Literacy & Budgeting Classes:** Offer educational programs to empower tenants with financial management skills, improving their ability to sustain tenancies.
4. **KCRHA \$5 Million Loan Rehab Program:** Implement a program where investors take the risk in renovating properties, boosting the availability of quality rental units.
5. **Educational Programs for Housing Providers:** Provide training on best practices for vetting tenants, ensuring fair and effective screening processes.

### Survey Insights: Kansas City Metro Housing Voucher Survey

Our survey highlighted several key findings (275 responses):

- **Diverse Groups:** The survey attracted a diverse group of respondents, notably featuring a significant representation from minorities (14.9%) and female-owned (39.5%) businesses.
- **Type of Ownership:** The majority of respondents reported owning either single-family homes (83.5%) or small multi-family properties (46.7%).
- **Housing Voucher Challenges:** A majority of survey respondents indicated they would rent to applicants with various forms of income support. This included 88.2% for VA Benefits, 79.9% for SSI Benefits, 89.8% for Social Security or Other Retirement Benefits, and 74.4% for provable 'Gig' employee income. However, only 39.8% of respondents were willing to rent to tenants using Housing Choice Vouchers (Section 8). This disparity

highlights the specific challenges and reluctance associated with the Housing Choice Voucher program among housing providers.

- **Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) Challenges:** A significant portion of the respondents in the survey highlighted specific challenges associated with the Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) program. Approximately half of the participants (50.3%) reported difficulties in dealing with the housing authority. Additionally, nearly an equal number (49.7%) expressed concerns over the protracted inspection processes and delays in the approval times for renters. This feedback underscores the operational and administrative hurdles faced by housing providers in the context of the Section 8 program.
- **Property Damage and Accountability:** Many housing providers shared experiences of significant property damage by tenants using vouchers, with limited support from housing authorities.
- **Preference for Independent Section 8 Programs:** Some providers expressed a preference for Section 8 programs in other jurisdictions like Independence, suggesting Kansas City could learn from these models.

#### **Impact Of Past Ordinances and If the SOI Ordinance Passes**

- **Regulatory Burden:** According to the responses, (57.8%) of property owners who sold their assets in the past five years attributed their decision primarily to the burden of excessive city regulations. This statistic highlights the considerable influence that local regulatory policies have on the choices of real estate investors in that region.
- **Potential Market Disruption:** About (58.2%) of survey respondents indicated they would sell their properties if the ordinance passes, potentially disrupting the rental market.
- **Reluctance to Invest:** Over half (52.4%) of the respondents in the survey indicated they would halt future investments in Kansas City, Missouri, if the proposed ordinance were to be implemented. This response suggests a significant potential impact on real estate investment in the region due to the ordinance.
- **Application Fee Wastage:** A significant number of providers might still avoid accepting vouchers, leading to unnecessary application fee expenditures for tenants.
- **Retaliation Concerns:** There is a widespread fear of retaliation under the ordinance (94.8%), with concerns about complaint procedures and the potential loss of rental licenses.

#### **Recommendations**

- **Reconsideration of the SOI Ordinance:** We recommend that the City Council and the Mayor reconsider the implementation of the SOI Ordinance, given its potential negative impacts on both tenants and housing providers.
- **Collaborative Approach with Housing Providers:** Engage in a dialogue with housing providers to understand their challenges and collaboratively develop more effective solutions.
- **Community Development Initiatives:** Focus on community development programs that enhance the quality of living and opportunities for low-income tenants.

- **Incentives for Housing Providers:** Create incentives for housing providers who actively participate in programs aimed at improving low-income housing accessibility.

## Conclusion

The goal of enhancing low-income housing accessibility in Kansas City, especially for marginalized groups, requires a multifaceted approach. By reconsidering the SOI Ordinance and implementing alternative strategies, we can create a more inclusive and effective housing ecosystem. It's essential to engage all stakeholders in this process to ensure sustainable and practical solutions that benefit the entire community.

## Housing Voucher Usage in Kansas City

In Kansas City, the dynamics of housing voucher utilization present a critical understanding of the rental market and the challenges faced. This report aims to offer a concise analysis of the current state of housing voucher usage based on data from Eviction Labs and local housing authorities.

### Total Rental Units in Kansas City

- According to Eviction Labs, there are **122,228 rental units** in Kansas City.

### Housing Voucher Overview

- The total number of housing vouchers in circulation is approximately **7,500**. This represents about **5%** of the total rental stock in Kansas City.

### Vouchers On The Street (Unused)

- The number of unused vouchers, commonly referred to as "Vouchers On The Street," is **311**.
- This represents approximately **3-4%** of the total vouchers and a fraction of the overall rental market.

### Current Voucher Leasing

- The current number of real-world vouchers being actively used is **8,372**.
- This figure includes the full amount of vouchers, which encompasses special and restricted-use vouchers not available to the average voucher list holder.

### Analysis

- The data suggests that the issue of unused vouchers affects less than **1%** of the total housing market in Kansas City.
- The perceived magnitude of the problem may be disproportionate to its actual scale, indicating a need for targeted strategies to utilize these unused vouchers effectively.

- The low percentage of unused vouchers points to a relatively efficient utilization of available resources in the housing voucher program.

## Conclusion

The housing voucher system in Kansas City, while not without its challenges, shows a high rate of voucher utilization with a small percentage of unused vouchers. This indicates a generally effective distribution and use of these resources within the rental market. However, the existence of unused vouchers, albeit a small fraction, highlights areas where further improvement and efficiency can be achieved. Strategies focused on maximizing the use of these unused vouchers could contribute to addressing specific housing needs in the community.

## Other Housing Provider Surveys

1. **Urban Landlords and the Housing Voucher Program (2018)**: Conducted by The Poverty and Inequality Research Lab at Johns Hopkins University for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, this study examined landlords' experiences with Section 8. It identified key issues such as inspection processes, bureaucratic frustrations, and tenant conflicts leading to nonparticipation in the program.
2. **The National Apartment Association Survey (2023)**: Surveying 286 buildings with 933,600 apartment units, this study found that while (63.6%) of providers accept Housing Choice Vouchers, there were significant issues with Public Housing Authority support, inspection processes, and the time taken for application approval and renter move-ins. Suggestions for improvement included streamlining processes, increasing transparency, and enhancing communication.
3. **Source of Income Discrimination Among Small Independent Housing Providers in Ohio**: A survey by the Central Ohio Real Estate Entrepreneurs revealed that although most small housing providers accept various income sources, a smaller percentage (62.6%) accepted Housing Vouchers. Key challenges included lengthy approval and move-in processes, unpredictable inspection standards, and long inspection durations. However, an improvement in these areas could increase their willingness to accept vouchers.

## Ordinance Gaps: Questions and Concerns Regarding Enforcement and Fairness

There are several critical gaps and concerns in the proposed Source of Income (SOI) Discrimination Ordinance. We aim to ensure that any legislation passed is fair, and effective, and does not inadvertently harm the rental market or create unjust burdens on landlords.

### Key Concerns and Questions:

1. **Evidence Requirement for Discrimination Accusations:**
  - What concrete evidence must a complainant provide to substantiate their claim before the city initiates a systematic investigation of a landlord's rental properties and screening practices?
  - How will the city ensure that these investigations are not triggered by unsubstantiated or frivolous complaints?
2. **Implications of Saying 'No' and Public Disclosure:**
  - Can landlords legally reject a rental application without risking an SOI discrimination complaint?
  - Will details of any filed complaints be made publicly accessible, and how will this affect the privacy and reputation of landlords?
3. **Neighbor Complaints and Disruptions:**
  - How will the ordinance address situations where neighbors have legitimate complaints about disruptive behaviors by tenants protected under this ordinance?
4. **Conflict with the Federal Fair Housing Act:**
  - The Federal Fair Housing Act mandates objective, uniformly applied criteria for tenant selection. This ordinance seems to require landlords to favor applicants from protected classes, potentially conflicting with federal law under the Supremacy Clause.
  - How does the ordinance reconcile with the need to treat all applicants, including non-voucher holders and those in lower income brackets, equitably?
5. **Severity of Fines and Penalties:**
  - The proposed fine for SOI discrimination is significantly higher than penalties for other types of discrimination. Is there a rationale for this discrepancy?
  - Why are additional fines imposed for late payments of the initial fine, and how does this align with the principle of equitable treatment across different forms of discrimination?
6. **Costs and Punitive Measures:**
  - The ordinance imposes multiple financial burdens on landlords once a complaint is filed, including mediation fees, fair housing class costs, and investigation fees. Are these costs proportionate, and how do they contribute to resolving the issue for the complainant?
  - Considering these costs, the ordinance appears more punitive for SOI violations than for other discrimination types. Why is SOI discrimination treated more severely than, for example, racial discrimination?

**7. Complaint Processing and Departmental Responsibilities:**

- Which specific department will be responsible for processing SOI discrimination complaints?
- What training and resources will be provided to ensure that complaints are handled efficiently and fairly?

**8. Impact on Non-Voucher Holders in Lower Income Brackets:**

- If landlords are compelled to prioritize voucher holders out of fear of retaliation or fines, how will this impact non-voucher holders, especially those in lower income brackets?
- Is there a risk that this ordinance might inadvertently create a new form of discrimination against non-voucher holders?

**Conclusion:** While the intent of the SOI Discrimination Ordinance to protect vulnerable tenants is commendable, it is crucial to address these gaps and concerns to ensure that the legislation is balanced, fair, and does not create unintended negative consequences. We recommend a thorough review and revision of the ordinance to address these issues before its enactment. The goal should be to create a framework that both protects tenants from unjust discrimination and ensures that landlords can maintain fair and effective property management practices.

## Addressing Concerns and Myths Questions & Answers

**Q: If most housing that falls within voucher limits is located in the East Side of Kansas City, and the Source of Income Ordinance is introduced with the claim that it will enable voucher holders to live in any neighborhood, what benefits do voucher holders gain if they are still largely restricted to the same neighborhoods?**

**A:** The introduction of the Source of Income Ordinance, intended to expand living options for voucher holders, faces a practical challenge if the majority of affordable, voucher-eligible housing is concentrated in specific neighborhoods like the East Side of Kansas City. Here's the potential impact:

1. **Limited Real Choice:** Even though the ordinance theoretically allows voucher holders to move anywhere in the city, the reality of market-driven rental prices means that their choices might still be confined to neighborhoods with lower rents, which may not necessarily be their preferred locations.
2. **Market Price Disparity:** The gap between voucher limits and market rents in higher-cost neighborhoods can be significant. If the rents in desired neighborhoods exceed voucher caps, tenants may not be able to afford the difference, effectively keeping them out of these areas.
3. **Potential Gentrification Impact:** In some cases, such ordinances can inadvertently contribute to gentrification. As voucher holders move into areas with slightly higher rents but within voucher limits, it can put upward pressure on rents in those neighborhoods, potentially displacing other low-income residents.
4. **Concentration of Poverty:** If voucher holders remain concentrated in certain neighborhoods due to economic constraints, it can perpetuate issues associated with poverty concentration, such as limited access to resources, employment opportunities, and quality education.
5. **Need for Broader Solutions:** This situation highlights the need for broader strategies beyond the ordinance. These could include increasing the voucher payment standards to better align with market rates, providing additional financial assistance for moving to higher-cost areas, and developing more affordable housing across a wider range of neighborhoods.



**Q: How have anti-landlord regulations over the past five years impacted the ownership of rental properties in Kansas City, Missouri, particularly among local housing providers?**

**A:** Recent data indicates a significant shift in the ownership of rental properties in Kansas City, Missouri, due to anti-landlord regulations. While the overall number of units owned by respondents has increased by approximately 50%, from 7,814 units five years ago to 11,727 units today, the trend within Kansas City itself tells a different story. In Kansas City, Missouri, there's been a noticeable decrease of 304 units, dropping from 2,625 units owned five years ago to just 2,321 units today, a decline of 11.58%. This decline is attributed to local housing providers selling off 587 properties within the city, a response to the cumulative effect of city ordinances and council actions over the past half-decade. This trend suggests a shift away from local, smaller-scale landlords towards potentially larger, out-of-state investors, raising concerns about the long-term impact on the local rental market and community.

Since the 2008 housing crisis, institutional investors from outside the state have acquired 8,000 single-family homes in the Kansas City metropolitan area. This trend remains a convenient and appealing exit strategy for local investors considering leaving the Kansas City market.

**Q: Do Source of Income (SOI) bans effectively increase housing access for voucher holders?**

**A:** Studies using testers to inquire about voucher acceptance show an increase in affirmative responses in areas with SOI bans compared to those without. However, these studies primarily assess initial responses and do not track the completion of the leasing process. This means there is limited data on whether landlords who initially accept vouchers go on to complete all necessary steps, including application, screening, HUD interactions, inspections, and actual leasing to voucher holders. Furthermore, there's no conclusive evidence linking increased voucher usage directly to SOI bans. Other factors, such as program improvements, enhanced HUD staffing and technology, or incentives, could also contribute to increased voucher usage, raising questions about the overall efficacy of SOI bans in improving housing access for voucher holders.

**Q: Considering the Housing Authority of Kansas City's (HAKC) Annual Plan for 2024 and the challenges within the Housing Choice Voucher Program, how would mandating housing providers to accept vouchers address the issue of securing enough vouchers for the current demand?**

**A:** The HAKC's 2024 Annual Plan indicates significant waitlists for public housing and housing choice vouchers, with thousands of individuals waiting for a voucher. The constraint of 60 days to secure housing upon receiving a voucher, especially in a tight rental market, poses additional challenges. Mandating housing providers to accept vouchers does not directly address the underlying issue of limited voucher availability. As of June 2023, HAKC reported approximately 300 individuals actively seeking housing with vouchers, often facing difficulties due to the limited

availability of studio and one-bedroom units, which comprise a small percentage of the total housing units in Kansas City. Even if housing providers are mandated to accept vouchers, the effectiveness of such a policy is limited without a corresponding increase in the number of vouchers and available suitable units. This is particularly critical for those with specific needs, such as smaller unit sizes or special accommodations. The HUD report highlighting unused vouchers underscores the complexity of the issue, indicating that the solution requires a multifaceted approach that goes beyond simply enforcing voucher acceptance.

## **Voucher Holder's Questions & Answers**

**Q: Can the Source of Income Ordinance potentially have adverse effects on both voucher holders and low-income tenants, exacerbating the housing shortage and causing rents to rise further?**

**A:** Yes, the Source of Income Ordinance could potentially lead to unintended consequences that affect both voucher holders and low-income tenants. By mandating that landlords accept housing vouchers, the ordinance might inadvertently increase administrative and compliance costs for landlords. These increased costs could lead landlords to raise rents to offset these expenses. Additionally, the ordinance might discourage some landlords from participating in the rental market, thereby reducing the overall housing supply. A decrease in available rental units, coupled with increased operational costs for landlords, could contribute to higher rents and intensified competition for housing, which would disproportionately affect low-income tenants and voucher holders.

## Housing Provider's Questions & Answers

**Q: What are the implications for landlords if a tenant's voucher amount changes or if a tenant violates program rules and loses their voucher, especially considering these factors are not present in the non-voucher market?**

**A:** When a tenant's voucher amount changes or if they lose their voucher due to program rule violations, it can create financial and operational challenges for landlords. Unlike the non-voucher market, where tenant selection is based on stable factors like income and employment history, voucher-based tenancies introduce variables that are out of the landlord's control. In such scenarios, a landlord might face the following issues:

1. **Rent Payment Adjustments:** If the voucher amount decreases, the tenant may be responsible for a larger portion of the rent, which they might not be able to afford. This could lead to delayed or missed rent payments, impacting the landlord's cash flow.
2. **Finding Replacement Tenants:** If a tenant loses their voucher and cannot afford the rent, the landlord may need to find a new tenant. This process involves vacancy costs, advertising, and tenant screening, all of which can be time-consuming and expensive.
3. **Legal and Administrative Complexities:** Navigating the changes in voucher status or dealing with non-compliance issues can involve additional administrative work and potential legal complexities, increasing the landlord's operational burden.
4. **Pricing Strategy Adjustments:** Landlords may need to factor these risks into their pricing strategy when renting to voucher holders. This could mean higher rents to offset potential losses or additional savings to cover periods of vacancy or non-payment.
5. **Impact on Property Maintenance:** Unstable rental income might affect the landlord's ability to maintain the property, leading to long-term degradation of the rental unit's value.

**Q: How might the Source of Income Ordinance impact the financial bottom line of small landlords?**

**A:** The Source of Income (SOI) Ordinance could potentially affect a small landlord's bottom-line profits. Implementing such an ordinance often means that landlords must accept various forms of income, including housing vouchers.

**This change can impact landlords in several ways:**

1. **Administrative and Compliance Costs:** Working with housing authorities can increase administrative workload due to paperwork, compliance with specific requirements, and navigating bureaucratic processes. This can be especially challenging for small landlords who might not have the resources or staff to efficiently handle these additional tasks.

2. **Inspection Requirements:** Housing vouchers often come with property inspection requirements to meet certain standards. Preparing for and passing these inspections might necessitate upgrades or repairs, incurring costs.
3. **Delayed Payments:** There can be delays in receiving payments from housing authorities, impacting cash flow. Small landlords, often reliant on consistent rental income to cover mortgages and other expenses, might find this particularly challenging.
4. **Potential Tenant Turnover and Vacancies:** If a landlord decides not to accept vouchers and the SOI ordinance is in place, they might face restrictions in tenant selection, potentially leading to increased vacancies.
5. **Legal and Training Expenses:** Understanding and adhering to new regulations may require legal consultation or additional training, adding to operational costs.
6. **Risk of Fines or Penalties:** Non-compliance with the ordinance can result in fines or legal action, impacting profits.

## Economic Effects Questions & Answers

### **Q: How can we retain and support local housing providers in Kansas City to maintain a stable and thriving rental market?**

**A:** Engage with those who are at the forefront of providing housing, seeking to understand their needs and challenges in maintaining existing housing units and exploring ways to create additional affordable options. The KC Regional Housing Alliance, representing a broad spectrum of organizations including property management, Realtors, investors, and landlord groups, collectively oversees more than 100,000 rental units in the region. As a unified voice for rental housing providers, we are committed to collaborating on the development of effective housing policies that balance the needs of both providers and tenants, ensuring sustainable and accessible housing solutions for our community.

#### **Here are some strategies:**

1. **Incentives for Property Improvement and Maintenance:** Implementing programs that provide financial incentives or tax breaks for landlords who invest in property improvements can encourage them to maintain and upgrade their rental units. This not only benefits tenants through better living conditions but also enhances the overall housing stock of the city.
2. **Streamlining Regulatory Processes:** Simplifying and streamlining regulatory requirements for landlords, such as permitting processes for renovations or construction, can reduce the administrative burden and make it easier for them to operate effectively.
3. **Fair and Balanced Legislation:** Ensuring that housing policies and ordinances are fair and balanced, protecting the rights and interests of both landlords and tenants, can create a more favorable environment for landlords to continue operating in the city.
4. **Support for Small Landlords:** Providing support and resources specifically for small landlords, who may not have the same resources as larger property management companies, can help them navigate challenges and remain competitive.
5. **Collaborative Initiatives with Landlords:** Encouraging collaboration between the city, housing authorities, and landlords through regular dialogues and partnerships can lead to more effective housing solutions that address the needs of all stakeholders.
6. **Educational Resources and Training:** Providing educational resources and training for landlords on best practices in property management, tenant relations, and legal compliance can improve their skills and knowledge, leading to better management of their properties.
7. **Responsive Support Systems:** Establishing a responsive support system within city departments that deal with housing, where landlords can get timely assistance and information, can improve their overall experience in dealing with city-related issues.

**Q: How could the Source of Income Ordinance potentially impact the housing market, especially concerning voucher holders and low-income tenants, considering that some investors might sell their properties if the ordinance is passed?**

**A:** Yes, the Source of Income Ordinance could potentially lead to significant changes in the housing market, affecting both voucher holders and low-income tenants. If the ordinance mandates landlords to accept housing vouchers, it may inadvertently increase administrative and compliance costs. These costs could compel landlords to raise rents to cover these expenses. Furthermore, the ordinance might discourage certain landlords from remaining in the rental market. According to the Kansas City Metro Housing Voucher Survey, 58.2% expressed their plan to sell their properties if the ordinance passes. These properties could potentially be purchased by institutional investors, which might further decrease the number of available rental units. As a result, there would likely be a reduction in affordable housing options, increased competition for the remaining units, and potentially higher rents. These developments would disproportionately impact low-income tenants and voucher holders, exacerbating the challenges they face in finding suitable and affordable housing.

## **Testimonials**

The testimonials provided are from respondents who participate in the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program. These testimonials offer insights into their experiences and perspectives on the program, highlighting various aspects of their involvement and the challenges they face. For a comprehensive view of these testimonials and a deeper understanding of the experiences of those who accept Section 8 vouchers, please refer to the original content on the MAREI website.



## Enhancing Low-Income Housing Accessibility in Kansas City, Missouri - January 20, 2024

Relying on private companies to handle public housing is extremely cumbersome.

---

Kansas City is continuing to make it unprofitable for landlords and seeks only the best for unqualified people ...there is no win here for hard working people investing in kc--I am out!

---

I have had three section 8 renters recently. One lost her section 8 benefits within two months of moving in. Two had issues in the last year with paperwork errors on the part of section 8 that held up rent for months and caused me headaches. Annual inspections are cumbersome even though i pass 90% of the time. Both rents are lower than anyone else in the building. I only take them because i am trying to be a good citizen, not because it is profitable. I would sell, or raise my rents significantly before i took on any more section 8 tenants. It has been nothing but problems.

---

This is government overreach, pure and simple. It is a political stunt to make those in power look great (woke) on the national stage. If you want landlord participation in solving a problem that they had no hand in creating, use a carrot approach, not the stick. Offer intelligent incentives to induce their enthusiastic participation. When facing the ham-fisted threat from local government, landlords will always find a way to thwart those bureaucrats' low-minded strategies.

---

Under no circumstance will I accept section 8 rental vouchers.

---

Renting to HCV voucher holders is not a problem for us per se. However this ordinance goes much further than that in removing the possibility for landlords to screen applicants with criminal records, evictions or bad rental history. Screening is a key part of a landlord's business: not being able to separate good and bad renters makes it not only a liability to our business but also to the tenants with good history who could benefit from our properties.

---

KCMO with crime, earnings tax, bad governance, and lack of support of housing providers prohibits any interest in property ownership there

---

I would like data collected with pictures showing how this goes of unpaid rent , move in and move out pictures from the day this ordinance passes for 2-3 years of good provable data to prove that not being able to screen or hold tenants accountable, the harm it had caused to owners and properties. Also stats on the rise in Evictions. And the costs to provide owners to implement new processes and procedures to try to protect their property. Rent increases. Again move in move out pics of how properties are when a tenant moves in and how properties are left by tenants at move out and/or eviction with damage costs!

---

I refuse to invest in KC. Too tenant friendly. Hating on landlords because of a few bad apples is not a good way to go.

---

KC is becoming less and less landlord friendly. I will move my investments to a different city that is more landlord friendly.

---

I get flagged for an intact screen leaning up against the bldg (ac was being moved) when house next door has wires hanging, peeling paint, trash & furniture on porch, etc and squatters in house on other side with a yard full of knee-high trash in back drawing rats, that I called on 3 x's! KCMO has it out for landlords and Im tired of it. I rent out my grandmothers house (I grew up in) since she passed in 1998, the house nextdoor & another a couple blocks away. My other properties are in NKC. They are WAY easier to deal with. I personally had Sec 8 in KCMO when I was a single parent (1980's) and they were as awful to tenants as they are to landlords. Everything in KCMO cityhall sucks.

---

Who is out to protect the investor? It is already so hard going through the legal system to get someone out when they violate the lease and don't pay rent. How are we to qualify to make sure people can pay/afford a place to rent? You have to qualify to buy, the same applies.

---

If the ordinance passes, there will be substantial safety issues for myself and our female tenants. I am very concerned . We are not prepared to suffer the financial losses of waiting for Section 8 inspections

---

## Enhancing Low-Income Housing Accessibility in Kansas City, Missouri - January 20, 2024

---

as well

---

I have previously rented (in Independence) to Section 8 tenant, but it got harder over the years to deal with the inspectors and delays because tenant had paperwork problems.

---

More regulations increase costs to owners, causing rental prices to be raised. Regulations also slow down the rate of transactions in a market, so that first time buyers and renters have a harder time buying or renting.

---

Kansas City needs to realize that they are running out businesses because they are short-sighted on making a quick buck and making it hard on investors as well as tenants. This is not going to help anyone in the long run. There's already plenty of places who accept vouchers and I believe it should be illegal for them to dictate who I can rent my property to.

---

I do not agree with the terms of the proposal.

---

My rents were very affordable before this years taxes made me raise most of them. And even now 80% of my rentals are under Section 8 rent levels. If this passes I will be forced to raise all my rents up to section 8 allowable rent prices and that combined with taxes etc will drive out any hope of offering "affordable housing" that Jackson County claims they are striving for.

---

I disagree with the terms of the proposal.

---

If this goes into effect, I will never consider moving back to the KC area.

---

Based on what I've heard in the ordinance, if I knowingly rent to a convicted felon, am I partially to blame if they commit another crime in my neighborhood, at least morally? The ordinance seems to not let me take criminality into consideration. Or if they have a history of evictions, I am stuck with the choice between legal and repair expenses or fines from the city.

---

Section 8 is not consistent on inspections, I've been failed on inspection for not having white caps on toilet bolts while the news is full of unsafe housing with serious issues, mechanical and safety issues, for years. Good landlords seem to be targeted for minor things while the above apparently are allowed to continue.

---

It is already hard enough to evict for non-payment, damage to property, and violating lease agreements. I would not have an issue with renting to anyone with any type of voucher provided there were laws to protect me from loss and ensured complete recoupment of loss due to renters failure to pay and damages. As it is now then tenant can stop paying rent and make false claims, get a lawyer and tie up the house in court for over a year and I loose income to collection agents, courts, and lawyers, and the tenant lives there for free until resolved, and then they have so many loopholes to keep from having to pay immediately or even the full amount owed because they could just claim bankruptcy.

---

This will decrease affordable options

---

Small family owned rental businesses feel the burden of government regulations and stipulations to do business far more than large investors who snap up properties around the area and then raise rent on normal working people. We purposely keep our rents relatively low so long term rents can continue to afford it. If we were to sell our buildings an investor could come in redo the units and double or triple the rents making them unaffordable for the lower income clients we provide safe suitable housing for.

---

Many changes to city policy have made doing business in KC more expensive. These expenses have been passed on to my tenants which contradicts what these special interest groups are trying to accomplish, "affordable housing".

---

Bottom line is there needs to be a mutual benefit to accepting section 8. At this point in time there is none, so I will move my investment dollars out of the city if required to participate.

---

Enhancing Low-Income Housing Accessibility in Kansas City, Missouri - January 20, 2024

---

Small mom and pop landlord owners should be allowed to choose the most qualified tenants. It is part of their retirement income. We do not do this out of charity. We are here to create a retirement income for ourselves and our family. It is not fair to lose money because we worked hard to save up money to purchase rental property to create a future for ourselves.

---

I own the properties.

City has no right to dictate how I do my business. Tenants that I have given an opportunity that didn't have great records tore up the house and did not follow through on paying rent all the while driving a Jaguar! Took a year to evict.

---

I have not, and will not, make any real estate investments in KCMO due to their anti-landlord laws and policies.

---

Housing vouchers is only one component and I think there could be a workable solution, however, no screening process whatsoever is very problematic. I could not buy the home I'm renting without a lender screening process, I had to qualify in order to get the loan to buy the house to rent. I'm not sure why there shouldn't be one for the party that rents it so that I can in turn use those rents to pay the mortgage I have on the property. The ordinance is so one sided it's incredible.

---

This should be a voluntary program.

---

We do not own the property numbers listed above, but are property managers of the properties. It is a concern of us for the new ordinance of being forced to accept housing vouchers as well as the terms we will have to follow when declining applicants, should the ordinance pass. We feel we are very fair in our processing, however should not be forced to accept a program.

---

## Works Cited

1. "Eviction Tracking: Kansas City, MO." Eviction Lab, Princeton University, Accessed 17 January 2024. <https://evictionlab.org/eviction-tracking/kansas-city-mo/>.
2. Housing Authority of Kansas City. "2024 Annual Plan for Comment." *Housing Authority of Kansas City*, 2023, [www.hakc.org/utility/openPDF/kchamo/2024 Annual Plan for Comment.pdf?alt=media](http://www.hakc.org/utility/openPDF/kchamo/2024%20Annual%20Plan%20for%20Comment.pdf?alt=media).
3. Housing Authority of Kansas City. "Tenant Selection FAQs." *Housing Authority of Kansas City*, 2023, [www.hakc.org/tenant-selection-faqs](http://www.hakc.org/tenant-selection-faqs).
4. Mid-America Association of Real Estate Investors. "Kansas City Metro Housing Voucher Survey." MAREI, 2023, <https://marei.org/2023-kc-metro-housing-provider-survey-results/>
5. "Public and Indian Housing." U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Accessed 17 January 2024. [https://www.hud.gov/program\\_offices/public\\_indian\\_housing](https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing).
6. "Source of Income Discrimination Among Small Independent Housing Providers in Ohio."
7. "Unveiling Reality: Rental Housing Providers' Insights into the Housing Choice Voucher Program." *National Apartment Association*, December 28, 2023, <https://www.naahq.org/unveiling-reality-rental-housing-providers-insights-housing-choice-voucher-program>
8. "Urban Landlords and the Housing Voucher Program." *The Poverty and Inequality Research Lab*, Johns Hopkins University, 2018.