

**From:** Kathi Netter  
**To:** [SHS Exhibits](#)  
**Cc:** [ld@oregonrha.com](mailto:ld@oregonrha.com)  
**Subject:** HB 2004-A  
**Date:** Thursday, May 04, 2017 11:15:31 AM

---

## PLEASE VOTE NO ON HB 2004-A!

I am a landlord in Lane County (U of O area) and strongly urge you to oppose HB 2004-A. Here is why:

- 1) It assumes all landlords across the state have the same business model. We do not. My particular niche is leasing one 5 bedroom, 2 bath 1930's house to 5 university students.
- 2) It changes the concept of a contractual lease in an unfair and biased manner. Currently, a landlord and a tenant sign a lease for a specified beginning and ending time. As a landlord, I plan ahead and create a window of time between tenants to maintain and upgrade the house without inconveniencing residents and to allow more hours to accomplish the tasks. Some of our projects have required an empty house, such as refinishing the hardwood floors, changing out windows throughout the house and removing all old "knob and tube" electrical wiring. Under the new rules, a tenant could decide to stay another month or two and the landlord must agree.
- 3) The 90 day rent payment penalty only applies to landlords who give a "no-cause" termination notice, and not to tenants who give a "no-cause" termination notice.
- 4) It has been said that there is always a reason for a "no-cause" termination. That is true, but it seems a kinder way to part ways than applying a permanent negative label on a situation. Presently, this is an equal opportunity for both tenant and landlord.
- 5) Current laws contain numerous tenant protections regarding habitability, safety, privacy, landlord access notifications and opportunities to rectify situations before termination. The proposed new rules seem overly beneficial to tenants.
- 6) I have made a significant financial investment in my rental property with what most investors would consider a minimal return (3-4%), but I happen to enjoy "recycling" old houses and it is satisfying to work with the younger student population as they inhabit their first adult housing experience.
- 7) Bottom Line: HB-2004-A is unfairly and unnecessarily biased toward only a particular segment of the tenant population. If more low-cost (and thus "affordable") housing is needed, incentives need to be available to potential landlords, not punitive measures.

Thank you for voting no on HB-2004-A.

Kathryn Netter