What does SB5089 do?
The bill places additional obligations and constraints on lodging establishments, including revoking the 90-day threshold for transiency at hotels and motels.

Reasons to oppose:

- Throughout the COVID-19 epidemic, and for many other emergency relief efforts (e.g., hurricane response), lodging businesses have voluntarily aided their communities through providing accommodations to medical personnel and first responders, stepping up to serve as field hospitals, and sheltering vulnerable populations. SB5089 would discourage such relief efforts in the future.

- Altering the landlord-tenant provision regarding the 90 day limit at hotels would mean all guests are treated as permanent residents, rather than transient occupants, and remove a clearly defined line that these businesses not only follow, but model their businesses around. Hotels are not structured to serve as permanent residences, nor equipped to serve in a landlord capacity.

- Individuals need permanent housing solutions, and landlords focused on the responsibilities of such long-term offerings; lodging establishments – even in emergency relief situations – are focused on serving short term transient guests, not permanent residents.

- Not only is such a change incongruent with the lodging business model, such a shift in the notion of transiency could undermine collections of sales and lodging taxes, which would be harmful to state and local government budgets that are already struggling from the effects of COVID-19.

- Importantly, reducing the 90-day threshold for lodging establishments will also subvert a hotel's ability to combat human trafficking, prostitution, and the manufacture/ sale of illicit drugs effectively and quickly.
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