

From: K. M.
To: [SHS Exhibits](#)
Cc: [Sen. Gelser](#); "[Sen.AlanOlsen@state.or.us](#)"; "[Sen.MichaelDembrow@state.or.us](#)"; [Sen Knopp](#); [Sen MonnesAnderson](#)
Subject: the housing crisis and HB 2004
Date: Thursday, May 04, 2017 7:36:22 PM

Dear Representatives,

I grew up in San Francisco. My mother grew up in San Francisco. The family business was buying and managing rental property. I watched the housing crisis unfold in the Bay Area and when I moved to Portland, watched it happen here. The solutions proposed by tenant's unions and the City Council—to end no-cause evictions and create a web of rent control and tenant protection measures—will do to Portland what they've done to San Francisco.

All rent control does is help tenants who've been in their apartments the longest. It gives long-term tenants an advantage, plain and simple. It does nothing to help young people, new renters, artists, public service employees, disabled, retired people Moreover, HB2004 and ending no-cause evictions do nothing to expand the pool of affordable housing.

Currently in the Bay Area, many property owners have begun to let apartments remain empty rather than rent them out because of relocation fees, disability and protected status of many groups, rent control, and the threat of lawsuits from tenants.

The solution to the housing crisis is to flood the market with affordable housing through set asides. Every time a building of more than four units goes up, there has to be 15-20% set aside for below market rent. Nearly every other city with a housing crisis in the U.S. now does this—New York, LA, and San Francisco. Set asides are just the cost of doing business.

I am a property manager and live in SE Portland. You know, where there's been probably 2000 apartments built in the last 2.5 years with a total of zero affordable housing included with them because there's no inclusionary zoning inside Portland. Builders and developers build and build, but never have to give a little. They can just pay into a fund and opt out.

Everyone involved in the housing crisis has to give a little: builders, landlords, the city, the county. It's a joint effort. With Portland though, it's always landlords and property managers who have to give, never the building industry. Why are they exempt from having to give up something?

I am completely opposed to HB2004 because:

1. This will do absolutely nothing to increase affordable housing, but will succeed in making it harder to provide affordable housing. Targeting landlords may seem like good politics, but you need to know most landlords are small, own few properties, and struggle to keep up with demand.
2. Tenants, not landlords, will ultimately pay for this. Every time the City makes it harder to rent, someone has to pay. Increasing taxes only makes housing pricier.
3. I evicted a man who threatened other tenants owing to his crystal meth use and alcoholism. I had to evict a drug addict who caused \$3800 worth of damage, who personally threatened me, and had to hire an attorney to protect myself against him—and I never recovered any money in Small Claims court in Portland.
4. HB 2004 will force landlords who can afford to, to go ahead and let some of their apartments stand empty. Putting more and more restrictions on landlords will reduce the number of apartments available.

As a resident and taxpayer, I am embarrassed by the partisan and political attack your office conducts. I demand a full written explanation of why you are proposing this and why you think singling out the provider of housing is the best way to get to affordable housing.

Sincerely,

K. Fufkin Vollmayer
PO Box 15133
Portland, OR