

From: monamarie@monamarie.com
To: [SHS Exhibits](#)
Subject: FWD: Opposition to HB 2004A - Please submit as written testimony
Date: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 9:48:49 PM

Dear Senate Committee on Human Services,

I'm writing to you again, asking that you please do not allow HB 2004A to pass, as written.

Because this bill may become law I've changed the way that I manage our rental properties and as a result one family moved out over Memorial Weekend and another family is scheduled to move out the end of July. Both families violated their rental agreements so we served FOR CAUSE (first notice) and NO CAUSE terminations. Both families were EXTREMELY concerned about what these notices were going to do to their rental history. I explained that I would rent to someone who received a NO CAUSE termination and I believe that other Property Managers would too. In all my years as a PM I've never had any tenant that we asked to leave on a NC termination, refused a future property on that alone.

The passing of HB 2004A will not protect tenants in any way, shape, or form. All tenants violate the standard rental agreement in some way (noise, trash, illegal pets, derelict cars, lack of yard maintenance) and they will suffer the consequences of YOUR actions if you vote yes for this bill. This bill will lead to more FOR CAUSE terminations that will tarnish the rental histories making it more difficult for tenants to qualify for rentals at all.

This bill allows for NO CAUSE terminations within the first 6 month. A lot of families are financially depleted during the first 6 months because they've used all of their savings to move into a new rental. How are they going to move again? With the passing of this law as written, the tenants will be critically scrutinized to be sure a landlord wants to keep them beyond 6 months and lose their right to a NO CAUSE termination.

Also, this clause alone will preclude me from signing a 12 month lease. I can guarantee that I'll never sign another 12 month lease again if I (as Landlord) lose the right to decide on whether or not to extend a lease or switch to month to month.

The current laws allows for 30, 60 or 90 days notice for NO CAUSE terminations, depending upon length of tenancy and where the property is located. I believe we can best serve tenants (and Landlords) by keeping NO CAUSE Terminations as an option but extend the period of time to 120 days notice. That allows the tenants a better opportunity to save their money to move and give them adequate time to find a property to move into.

Thank you,

Monamarie McCreary, SFR
M&M Real Estate Solutions, Inc
Principal Broker
www.MandMRealEstateSolutions.com
503-348-3025

 [Twitter](#)

 [Facebook](#)

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Opposition to HB 2004A - Please submit as written testimony

From: <monamarie@monamarie.com>
Date: Wed, May 03, 2017 6:45 am
To: shs.exhibits@oregonlegislature.gov

Dear Senate Committee on Human Services,

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 or sending our kids/grandkids to college in the future. We're not all big conglomerates that are rolling in money so please don't treat us all as if we are financially affluent or have unlimited bank accounts.

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.

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. We 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 less than "stellar" 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. There will be fewer rental units available if this law passes. We sold one of our SFR rental properties this year, to avoid dealing with the **ANNUAL restrictions put on property owners (from OR Legislature)** that rent to people in Oregon. And I've read in many others' testimony that they too will or are considering getting out of the rental market.
 - b. 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.

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?

I don't believe that this overreaching bill protects tenants in any way and it will negatively impact the current RETIREMENT SAVINGS CRISIS in the State of Oregon too. Many other retirees have submitted their objections to HB 2004 and HB2004A also. Retirees are families that need protecting too.

I believe changing the Urban Growth Boundary making property more affordable, is the answer to this and many other housing related problems. Trying to cure this problem on the back of the small Retiree/Investor will only exacerbate many housing related challenges as well as further depressing the income for Oregon Retirees.

Sincerely,
Monamarie & Albert McCreary
We are: Retiree/Investors AND FAMILY TOO!
503-348-3025

Monamarie McCreary, SFR
M&M Real Estate Solutions, Inc
Principal Broker
www.MandMRealEstateSolutions.com
503-348-3025

 [Twitter](#)
 [Facebook](#)