

From: jim
To: [SHS Exhibits](#)
Subject: testimony re house bills and rent control
Date: Thursday, May 04, 2017 5:02:45 PM

For context, I am the owner of several small complexes in the Portland metro area. They are all professionally managed, and over the past several years I have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars into these buildings to bring them to a standard that makes them a desirable place to live. I invest in properties that have been mismanaged and neglected, in many cases creating a tenant hazard that must be remediated (which I do). These are working class and middle class units—not “palaces” in the pearl.

I still have many units with long standing tenants whose rent is in the \$800 range. I have only once directed an eviction without cause—this for a tenant who was shooting drugs during an inspection, and then my contractors rehabbing a unit next door noticed drug sales going on. A for cause eviction is cost prohibitive, and likely would not prevail as the individual witnesses were afraid to testify.

The proposal as written will harm good tenants and landlords by making it cost prohibitive to address problems that are caused by a very small minority of tenants. All rents will need to increase to cover those costs, and landlords will be less willing to “take a chance” on a tenant who has made some bad choices in the past, even if they seem to have their affairs in order now. I do not believe the long term solution to the current housing shortage is to make investing in housing less attractive. There may be short term benefit for a few tenants lucky enough to have low rent, but long term investment in both new housing and upgrading “low standard” housing will suffer.

There is a place for tenant safeguards, but this is a two way street. Not all tenants are saints or victims, and not all landlords are greedy and evil.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Jim Carlisle