

From: tina yep
To: [SHS Exhibits](#)
Subject: Vote no on HB2004A
Date: Tuesday, May 23, 2017 12:07:51 PM

Dear Senator Commitee,

I am writing to ask you to please keep in mind that many rental properties are owned by FAMILIES that are just trying to hedge themselves financially against rising costs of the future by making sacrifices today, trying to keep ourselves above water financially. We are families who are planning for retirement, to care for our parents, and to send our kids to college in the future. I own 2 rental SFH and was planning on saving to invest in more rentals. However, HB2004A makes me hesitate at the idea.

I constantly hear tenants argue that if Landlords don't want to deal with the problems, then they should get out of the business. But the flip side of that argument is if you don't like the rules of renting then, don't rent. I don't subscribe to either of these lines of thought. As a community we need to work together and find a way forward that protects both vulnerable tenants and vulnerable landlords. As a former renter, I do think tenants need protections against unscrupulous landlords.

However, a lot of us "landlords" are one "rent check" away from property foreclosure. If the tenant doesn't pay, we can't pay our mortgage either. If they are late, we do not sleep. We make personal sacrifices to make up for poor tenant behavior.

H2004A will disrupt an orderly housing market, increase deferred maintenance of existing housing stock, damage tenant reputations, lead to abandonment of existing rental units and create a shift from rental-owned to owner-occupied housing. Is that really what the State of Oregon wants for an already overwhelmed rental market? If this bill passes it WILL lead to more homeless families, not less.

I agree with the many other people that have written in their objection letters/statements, that there are many negative

consequences to this bill, for tenants as well as property owners:

1. A “For Cause” eviction will DESTROY a tenants ability to rent. I try and work with tenants as an alternative to eviction, knowing that under the current laws a “No Cause” eviction is an affordable option if our “work around” doesn’t work out. (No right minded landlord evicts without good reason because it COSTS MONEY for turnover.)

2. Any applicant(s) with mediocre credit, employment & rental history will not be given a chance to prove themselves if HB2004A passes.

3. Reduction in the quality and quantity of housing and rents will go up. Restrictions on increasing rent will restrict a landowners ability to maintain property and discourage investing in rental properties.

a. Fewer small investors will want to get into this business with all of the restrictions saddled on the investors and fewer builders will want to be involved in Oregon rental real estate too.

b. In consideration of the restrictions, I will look to other investment opportunities instead of housing.

Pg 5 7(B) Pay one month rent to tenant if landlord uses an exception and terminates the tenancy: If this money is paid to the tenant before they move what will prevent the tenant from “HOLDING OVER”?

Then the property owner has to take the tenant(s) to court to evict the hold over? Or collect damages?

This new law makes it IMPOSSIBLE for a property owner to terminate tenancy, remodel the house and sale for the maximum amount they are able to. How can this possibly be right? This law will not only screw up the rental market, it’s going to impact an already depressed real estate market too.

PAGE 3, Line 10 4c: VIOLATION OF CONTRACT LAW "...The

landlord shall make the tenant an offer in writing to renew the tenancy for a fixed term that is at least equal in duration to the existing fixed..." What if the landlord doesn't want to renew a one year lease? Or what if the landlord just doesn't want to continue a business relationship with this tenant?

Recently, I had a tenant who rarely paid in full and on time. They seemed to be always in crisis, always between 15-30 days late. As a former renter, I understand that crisis happens and compassion is needed. I do believe the tenant had fallen on hard times. I did not evict her without cause. Having said that, there is a limit to how long I can tolerate late rent, not knowing if this situation would end in eviction, loss of rent, and/or damage to property. At the end of the lease, I decided to end our business relationship. I did tell her why, but I did not have to justify it to a third party. In the end, I lost a month of rent and did not take her to small claims. It is government overreach to ask Landlords to justify why one party does not want to continue the business relationship, if it is at a natural end. With the new restriction, this would be IMPOSSIBLE. Landlords should not be forced to be in a continued business relationship with a tenant if the lease has come to an end.

I do believe Tenants need to be protected from conglomerate landlords and owners that take advantage of our housing market. But this bill needs to be worked on more to protect small landlords. Small landlords work with tenants to solve issues and but also need cost efficient tools to resolve troublesome situations without legal confrontation.

Many others have submitted their objections to HB 2004 and HB2004A also. We are families that need protecting too.

Please represent me and your constituents at the state capitol by opposing HB 2004-A and ANY bill that would eliminate no-cause notices and require continuation of tenancy at the end of lease.

Respectfully your constituent,
Tina Yep