



## HIGHLIGHTS “EVICTIONS IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY REPORT”

FINDINGS	DISCUSSION ITEMS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p><b>Finding #2.</b> ... The average time to evict a tenant for failure to pay rent in Montgomery County is 12 to 13 weeks.</p>	<p><b>Discussion Issue #1. Discuss with relevant stakeholders in the County the benefits and drawbacks of establishing a pre-filing notice requirement for failure to pay rent actions.</b> If the Council determines that such notice requirements should be established, it could work with State legislators and other stakeholders to establish requirements within State law</p> <p><b>See also Finding #18.</b> Pre-filing notice in failure to pay rent cases may reduce the number of court filings, however pre-filing notice is not required in Maryland. Maryland jurisdictions have a higher filing rate compared to jurisdictions that require pre-filing notice.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation #1. Request that the Executive revise the County’s plain-language lease summary to more clearly define rent obligations and to provide contact information for eviction assistance programs.</b> “... rent obligations and consequences of nonpayment are not clearly defined in these documents.”</p>
<p><b>Finding #5. Evictions</b> in Montgomery County <b>are expensive for landlords</b> and have far-reaching negative consequences for tenants.</p>		
<p><b>Finding #10. Research shows that emergency financial assistance programs are most cost effective when they narrowly target households at highest risk of homelessness.</b> OLO’s review of research on emergency financial assistance programs found that while programs are effective in preventing homelessness, some programs could be more cost-effective if they <i>more narrowly targeted</i> households that were most at risk of homelessness.</p>		
<p><b>Finding #12.</b> County emergency financial assistance programs target households that can avoid eviction with <b>one-time financial assistance</b>, in contrast to some programs in other jurisdictions that provide longer-term assistance to serve more vulnerable households. Consistent with the City of Gaithersburg’s experience, a nationwide review of emergency financial assistance programs also found that <b>programs that</b></p>	<p><b>Improving eviction assistance with data/program efficiency</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation #3. Request that the Executive track and report data on emergency financial assistance grant recipients including zip code, gender, race, income, and repeated use of the program.</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation #2. Request that the Executive report to the Council on opportunities to work with high-writ, high-eviction multi-family properties to develop strategies to reduce evictions.</b></p> <p>Opportunities may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborating with high-Writ and high-</li> </ul>

<p><b>target the most vulnerable households offer multiple months of assistance.</b></p>	<p>At present, DHHS does not track data on households that receive assistance, such as demographics and whether they have used the assistance repeatedly.</p>	<p>eviction landlords to prevent eviction for high-risk tenants by offering payment plans and linking tenants with services that may help the tenant avoid having legal action taken against them; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussing with landlords the benefits of voluntarily providing notice in plain language to tenants that have fallen behind on the rent before filing legal complaints, though this may be challenging given that State law does not require landlords to provide notice.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Recommendation #3. Request that the Executive track and report data on emergency financial assistance grant recipients including zip code, gender, race, income, and repeated use of the program.</b> At present, DHHS does not track data on households that receive assistance, such as demographics and whether they have used the assistance repeatedly.</p>
<p><b>JUST CAUSE EVICTIONS:</b> Given the ongoing discussions around a possible state bill, the report does not ignore this topic. The report does address just cause evictions in a discussion on common remedies available to housing providers. While it acknowledges that such ordinances are commonly found in jurisdictions with rent control, it cites cities where such laws do not prohibit housing providers from increasing rents to motivate residents to leave voluntarily. (See p. 13)</p>		



## HIGHLIGHTS “EVICTIONS IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY REPORT”

**Estimated total # rental units: 90,221** per DHCA survey

**Property type:** Specifically, 142 out of 597 apartment properties accounted for only 25% of housing units but 69% of Writs and 60% of evictions in apartments. (p. 108)

**The number of evictions *decreased* during fiscal years 2010-2017.** For the fiscal years 2010 through 2017, between 45,000 and 50,000 landlord-tenant cases (most of which were Failure to Pay Rent cases) were filed annually in Montgomery County. Of those annual filings, 10,000 to 12,000 cases resulted in Writs of Restitution (eviction orders) each year, and 800 to 1,100 of those Writs of Restitution resulted in evictions each year. During this overall period, landlord-tenant cases declined by 5 percent, Writs of Restitution declined by 17 percent and physical evictions declined by 19 percent -- in spite of population growth and an increase in the total number of rental units in the County. (p. iii and

**Finding #6)**

**Finding #8. Three of the County’s election districts have significantly more Writs of Restitution and evictions than other parts of the County:** District 13 (Silver Spring & Wheaton-Glenmont), District 9 (Gaithersburg, Montgomery Village & southern Germantown) and District 5 (Burtonsville & White Oak).

**Finding #9.** Writs of Restitution and evictions are concentrated in low-rent garden-style apartment buildings.

Fiscal Year	L&T Cases Filed	L&T Cases Excluding Dismissed	Tenant Appeared	MCSCO Writs Received	Total # Evictions	% Writs Leading To Eviction
<b>FY10</b>	<b>48,078</b>	<b>29,442</b>	<b>1,609</b>	<b>12,548</b>	<b>1,033</b>	<b>8%</b>
FY11	50,258	32,393	1,447	13,057	1,099	8%
<b>FY12</b>	<b>48,793</b>	<b>31,612</b>	<b>1,228</b>	<b>12,383</b>	<b>1,023</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>FY13</b>	<b>47,612</b>	<b>32,312</b>	<b>1,286</b>	<b>13,395</b>	<b>964</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>FY14</b>	<b>47,380</b>	<b>34,411</b>	<b>2,581</b>	<b>11,547</b>	<b>917</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>FY15</b>	<b>44,465</b>	<b>29,956</b>	<b>1,348</b>	<b>10,766</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>FY16</b>	<b>45,395</b>	<b>34,447</b>	<b>1,736</b>	<b>11,057</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>FY17</b>	<b>45,827</b>	<b>37,334</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>10,451</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>8%</b>