

## Rosenberg Corey

---

**From:** liz@lzdrealtor.com - 1 <liz@lzdRealtor.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 03, 2017 1:18 PM  
**To:** SHS Exhibits  
**Cc:** lzi@lzdrealtor.com  
**Subject:** HB 2004 - please stop the landlord witch hunt

Dear Committee Members and Senators,

In light of the current HB2004 proposal, I'm urging you to NOT pass this poorly conceived bill that **shows absolutely no fairness to landlords.**

I agree that something needs to be done to solve Oregon's current problems, and clearly Oregon needs more housing. But I also believe the legislature - both Oregon and especially Portland - is looking in the wrong place. Landlords do not create new housing, developers do. If there were more housing for all of the people both currently living in Oregon, and the droves that are moving here daily, affordable rent might not be the issue, because the market would have a better chance of sorting itself out. **Why not make it easier for developers to build affordable housing, rather than attempting to sacrifice the landlords?**

I'm also wondering **why the legislature is in favor of giving both the government and the tenant control over landlords' businesses and livelihood.** What other businesses out there would thrive or even survive in an environment like that? To me, it's like a business owner letting a random customer decide what is best for the business. In that scenario, how long do you think that business would last before it had to fold for lack of direction, operations or funds? And by the way, are you sure it is constitutional to control one's right to do what they see fit with their own property?

Here are a few reasons to consider opposing HB 2004  
From a landlord's perspective:

- **There is no provision for dealing with bad tenants** who are difficult if not impossible to catch in the act. Keeping them around for 90 days potentially ensures the destruction of one's property, and the potential of losing other surrounding tenants if their right to quiet enjoyment is being violated.
- **There is no provision to close some of the paperwork loopholes** tenants and their predator attorneys use to win eviction cases, when the tenant otherwise is clearly in violation. The landlord is not only stuck with a tenant who is destroying the quiet enjoyment of the property and other tenants; the landlord now also has to pay attorney fees. ( This happens far more frequently then you may imagine - if in doubt, please talk to some landlord attorneys.)
- If the relocation compensation idea does pass, **there is no provision for landlords that says tenants are only entitled to relocation money IF they return their unit in good condition. In all fairness, why would that not be included in this bill?**
- **Landlords are providing a service in exchange for compensation.** It is not a joy to be a landlord, it is a business. It is hard work, with a definitive lifestyle of "always on call". If the business model stops making sense, it is time to get out of the business.
- Handing control over to the tenants in terms of whether or not THEY stay undermines that business. **If you owned a business, would you let your customers tell you how to run it?**

- **Forcing a 2 year notice on when to sell is not conceivable** for some people. Most people do not have the means to forecast. And what happens if a landlord has a financial emergency? It could result in bankruptcy.
- If a landlord is asking a tenant to move in order to update their property, or in the event of a emergency, why must a landlord pay someone for that privilege? **Please do not punish landlords for a problem they did not create.**

From a realtor's perspective:

- **There is no provision for of the sale of a rental house**, when the buyer wants to occupy a unit that is currently rented to a tenant. This means less revenue either to the seller on their capital gain, (less tax to you again), or the potential for the buyer not getting the loan. (yes \$4500 can kill a loan).
- **This bill will cripple the landlord industry in Oregon, which I assume brings in considerable market revenue and taxes.** If landlords cannot profit on their investment, they will stop investing in Oregon.
- If the mom and pop landlords cannot afford to own property and keep tenants, or it just becomes too difficult to be a landlord in Oregon, landlording will become more institutionalized. There may be fewer rental houses and more apartment buildings, which lowers the quality of tenant lifestyle.
- **Tenant quality of life will be impaired, not enhanced**, no matter where they live, if there is no money for maintenance.
- **Properties will devalue. Tax assessments will also be affected.**

Thank you for reading.  
Liz Dauw, Landlord, realtor.  
503-880-5561