

Dear Chair Keny-Guyer and members of the Committee,

I am a resident of Oregon. I am a property manager. I am also a former renter, having rented from 1998 through 2016. Some of the owners that I represent are also renters themselves. I understand that there is a housing problem right now that needs to be addressed. However, I am not at all confident that HB 2004 is the answer. With all due respect, I think that, while its intention is noble, it will in fact create many more problems.

I attended the morning hearing yesterday but time ran out and I did not have the opportunity to speak. I want to thank you for taking the time to read this testimony.

I manage property for 119 homeowners who are currently renting out their homes to residents of Oregon. These 119 homeowners collectively own 151 rental properties. That is an average of 1.27 units per owner. These are not big time landlords who own many units and they cannot afford to pay relocation assistance. When the City of Portland passed the relocation ordinance, I did not have to retract a single notice because these homeowners are fair and reasonable, and none of them had raised rents by 10% or more.

I have received countless emails and phone calls from my homeowners (some of whom are also your constituents) who are deeply troubled by this proposed bill and the ramifications of its potential passing. Many have expressed to us that they will be putting the homes on the market to sell. They are extremely apprehensive over the current and potential future regulations on property owners. This will certainly take many more homes out of the rental market as most of these homes will be become owner-occupied. Essentially, this bill will contribute to an increased shortage of rental housing in Oregon, because many good landlords will decide that it is just too much of a risk to be a landlord here. To be certain, people are already pulling out of the Oregon market. The passage of this bill will only cause that number of people to increase. Less rental homes = more people without somewhere to live.

I urge you not to pass this bill in its current form. I believe that, if it is indeed passed, there need to be addendums added to allow for exemptions and **I do not believe that those exempt should be required to pay the relocation assistance**. These exemptions, in my opinion, should include (but are definitely not limited to):

1. Owners who own less than a certain number of rental properties.
  - I do not believe that small time landlords, especially those who only own one or two units, should be required to pay relocation assistance. These landlords themselves are often in financial strain.
2. Owners who are only renting their home while they have been displaced for work or military reasons, and who intend on returning to their home.
  - This could be someone who has been stationed overseas and does not have another residence. As written, this bill would require someone who is serving our country to pay three month's rent plus the amount of the security deposit to their tenant just to return to their own home. If they cannot, they then become homeless. Many of our service

men and women would not be able to afford to pay the assistance. Problem = not solved.

I also have some concerns regarding the repeal of the prohibition on local rent control. From what I can tell, it is much too broad. It does not put into place any regulations to control what local counties may declare and does not make suggestions on what potential restrictions to place on the wording of any ordinances. For example, what is to prevent a (bad) tenant from taking advantage and subletting their rent-controlled unit to others to make a profit? Sure, that is covered in most (good) landlords' leases, but it should be made clear in the bill and any resulting legislation.

I do not feel that this bill will provide the intended benefits if passed in its current form. Putting the cost and burden of the housing crisis on landlords alone is not indicative of the kind of community that I want to live in.

Thank you again for your time and consideration,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Katie McNeeley', with a decorative flourish at the end.

Katie McNeeley