

Dear Committee Members:

I'm sending this email to express my concern about HB 2004. I own a rental house in Bend, Oregon in the Cooper Canyon development and have been renting it out for over 10 years. I have had many lovely tenants who have lived in the house for a year or more and some that have been disrespectful of the property and the neighbors who I have asked to leave at the end of their lease. I love Oregon and my rental property and would hope to keep making it available to renters for years to come. However the provisions of HB 2004 give me great concern.

Why should a landlord not be permitted to terminate a month-to-month tenancy? Isn't that the entire definition of month-to-month? If you enacted these provisions I can never imagine allowing anyone to rent my house under such terms and I can tell you I have had many happy renters in the past who have chosen to rent for less than a year based on their personal circumstances. I think removing the possibility of month-to-month rentals would not be helpful to renters if that is your target demographic with this provision.

As to requiring a fixed term tenancy to become month-to-month unless the renter wants to renew seems odd to me as well or requiring me to offer an extension. What if the tenant has not been a good tenant? What if I want to take the house off the market and fix it up? What if the rates I'm paying have changed and I need to raise the rent in order to be able to afford the house? I can tell you in the past that when a good renter wants to stay and I need to raise the rents I have never raised them to what the market would allow – I have only raised them slightly in the interest of keeping a good tenant. I think landlords will make good choices to keep good tenants.

What is a "bad" tenant you might ask? One who grows pot in your home, ruins the hardwood floors with the excessive water they need and leaves your home smelling like pot. The police would do nothing and the neighbors constantly complained because the renters were rude, disrespectful and did nothing to stop their dogs from barking day and night. If I had not been able to terminate that tenant at the end of their lease how would that have been fair to me or the neighborhood? Why should that person have a right to stay in my home and destroy it? The cost to clean and fix it when they left far exceeded any security deposit.

Having lived in Berkeley, California for many years in the past I can tell you that rent control and strict provisions that favor tenants at the sake of landlords is not a recipe for a good housing situation. The houses and apartments become horribly run down as there is no incentive for the landlords to spend money to keep them nice. The tenants become squatters and real estate values decline. The crime rate has continued to rise every year since rent control has been enacted.

It is not clear to me what problems you are trying to address here but the proposed solutions do not seem to be in the best interest of the towns or the State. Thank you for your time.

- Allison Tilley

The contents of this message, together with any attachments, are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed and may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, or any attachment, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender or the Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman Help Desk at Tel: 800-477-0770, Option 1, immediately by telephone or by return E-mail and delete this message, along with any attachments, from your computer. Thank you.