

Dear elected official,

I am writing to you to oppose the HB 2001, HB2003 and HB 2004.

The biggest problem I see is not being able to evict some tenants that fly under the radar when it comes to proving their ill behavior in our rental housing. As landlords, we are not in the business of eviction; we are in the business of renting our properties for a return on our investment.

We do not work for a large corporation to benefit from a 401K and have the company match a certain percentage of our contributions. We have to provide for now, our future and our retirement.

We have to make sure that if we are to stay in this business, we have to be able to control of what goes on our properties, keep all tenants to enjoy their homes and not be forced to "tolerate" bad behavior of a few tenants at the expense of all the other tenants.

Personally, I only had to use the No- cause eviction once, when I needed to do major repairs to the house.

However, now, I really wished that I had used that option when one of the tenants failed to pay rent and I proceeded with the eviction process instead of giving him the No-cause notice to move out. The whole process took five month before I was able to re rent the apartment. The reasons? First from August to November, the tenant paid no rent. Going to court, the tenant alleged claims for not paying the rent. At that time I had to hire a lawyer to defend my case which cost time and several thousands dollars. In the mean time, the tenant trashed the place and it took time and more money to store his left behind belongings, clean and dispose after I won the judgment, re paint, re carpet, re rent by December. This is not a fair and cheap process.

We were left with a paper, a judgment in our favor, one we could not collect even to this day.

We call rent "funny money"! You get the money in rent, but you have to give it back in the form of property taxes, insurance, business license, continuing education, lawyers, city inspections, water and sewer charges, trash and garbage fees, maintenance and upkeep, evictions, payroll, management fees, etc. So, if you are lucky to have a good year than you are taxed from property taxes, to city taxes, to Tri-Met taxes, to county taxes, to payroll taxes, to Oregon taxes and IRS taxes.

I used to empathize with my tenants, even though I heard that we were called " white and racists".

I did not increase rents for years during the economic downturn.

I feared we would not make it when few years in a row we ran on red.

However, If we will have to choose between running our business VS being forced to pay relocation costs, I will have to change the way I operate my private investment. We would be forced to prepare to Evict a tenant even before we rent to a tenant. How? By increasing the rents and deposits to provide a reserve needed to

deal with relocation fees.

I know by doing that I lose, BUT so will the tenants.

Bottom line, the percentage of tenants that were actually given a No-Cause eviction mainly because a handful of new property owners decided to empty the building and completely remodel is very small. However, as a business owner, I understand that sometimes it takes money to make money. We need to invest in our business to make it work.

Everyone loves a clean and habitable place. Most landlords want to provide that. We need the city and the county to help us keep our places safe. We NEED to be able to evict trouble tenants in order to keep our properties safe, habitable and profitable.

I am also in opposition to rent control. Even though I don't often increase rents more than 6-8%, at times a landlord may be forced to increase rent above 10% in order to recoup loses, plan for a remodel, perform evictions, or just keep up with the increase in the expenses of doing business. The hike in rents also is necessary to keep up with the rate of inflation, to stay competitive and pay your obligations.

There are many variables at play:

1. Monthly mortgage, and interest together with mortgage insurance
2. Utility expenses, property taxes, Liability Insurance, umbrella insurance, that are not under our control,
3. The condition of the property, need of repairs and upgrades,
4. The amount of rent being charged,
5. The location of the property,
6. The amenities provided,
7. The number of units in a property,
8. The overhead costs such as vendors, property management,
9. Number of vacancies, '
10. Number of evictions, lawyer fees, court fees,
11. Single family home VS multifamily apartments

The fact is there is not one example where by controlling the rent the city was able to eliminate homelessness and create more housing.

I oppose HB 2001, HB 2003, HB 2004.

Sincerely,
Daniela Fora
Petru Fora