

## Rosenberg Corey

---

**From:** Ron-Janet Bevirt <bezny@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 01, 2017 6:21 PM  
**To:** SHS Exhibits  
**Subject:** Vote NO on HB-2004-A

This **Bill HB-2004-A** would negatively affect my rental property business of 5 units.

It would not assist my tenants and could **negatively impact them**.

I oppose HB-2004-A and all its amendments. My ability to do business as a landlord in Oregon will be hampered. I don't want forced rent control that makes it even harder to evict bad renters. If an issue such as the greater profits for property owners from "gentrification" is negatively affecting tenants, then the law needs to more specifically address that. Perhaps specific rental contract language would be a more appropriate solution than the proposed law change.

Do not change no-cause eviction law and require landlords to pay for evicted tenants to move.

HB-2004-A PROHIBITS landlords from terminating a month-to-month tenancy without cause, except under certain circumstances, with 90 days' written notice and payment of relocation expenses that could be upwards of \$5000.

It also REQUIRES that fixed term tenancies become month-to-month tenancies on the ending date, UNLESS the tenant elects to renew or terminate tenancy and REQUIRES the landlord to make tenant an offer to renew fixed term tenancy. I presently renew to a fixed term tenancy and do not want to be forced to have to continue with a difficult tenancy or be forced into a month to month tenancy. This bill now proposes that the tenant is to be empowered to make decisions regarding whether they can continue and determine the lease terms of my property, not me as the landlord. I pay the property taxes. I pay the insurance coverage. I make sure the property is cleaned prior to tenancy and maintained to be safe and pleasant throughout tenancy. I carry the liability for tenants behaviors and actions.

Please do not repeal the statewide prohibition on Rent Control. Rent Control is not the answer.

For the last 35 years I've been a property owner and manager of 5 rentals in Lane County. As a smart investor, I take care of my properties and my tenants' needs. I want to keep good tenants that respect my property, their neighbors, and are responsible to pay rent on time as well as communicate about any rental issues that need resolution.

Landlord's want to keep good tenants, but even if that is the case, there may be reasons to have a rental available for family visiting from Europe for 2 to 3 months (mine live in Poland and Germany), for major remodeling or replacement of carpets, etc. Last year I had tenants living in 3 houses while new roofs and more attic installation was installed. It was not very nice for them during that time but they were cooperative. The concept that a tenant decides when my rental could be available after a completed lease is ridiculous. I know the several times that I have had renters for 8 years they seem to feel they now own the place and their changes to my properties have been unbelievable. One tenant sawed through a window frame into the wall structure to fit in an air conditioner, another tenant installed a wood stove. I have found that ending tenancies after four years is fairly essential in order to retain property integrity, the cleanliness and maintenance of the property. Also, it is necessary to begin a new tenancy when none of the original tenants are present in the household, because at this point no one has a financial security deposit stake to lose and thus do not care to clean or maintain the property.

Another case that stands out, is a new tenant that moved into a house when a roommate moved out. This prospective tenant interviewed with her Mom and younger sister present with the 3 roommates, and with my husband and I as property managers to discuss the rental agreement paperwork. After a few months her roommates discovered she was a pole dancer in Springfield, she was bringing home many different guys, some with guns, and this concerned the original tenants. She was asked to leave the house by the tenants, she cooperated, we allowed them to find another roommate and changed the locks for the household's security. This remedy under rent control would not have been allowed. Rent control could be counter tenant's protective rights and concerns.

Again, no one wants to lose a responsible tenant. Usually a difficult tenant is given a no-cause eviction to avoid having a legal battle with that tenant. If a tenant abuses the property or threatens other tenants, it is the landlord's duty to deal with those issues.

What problems does this law seek to correct and what could be the unintended consequences it actually causes? If the answer is rent increases, a general yearly percentage cap could be put in place that allows for a 3% yearly tax increase (in Lane County), along with increases in property insurance, cleaning and repair costs.

This HB-2004-A Bill is insanely unjust to property owners. I have written this letter to voice my disapproval for such a radical rental agreement change.

Please **vote in opposition to HB-2004-A and its amendments to effect rent control, the elimination of No Cause Notices of Termination, or to repeal the statewide prohibition of cities and counties to regulate rents.**

Thank You,

Janet Bevirt

2915 Charnelton St

Eugene, OR 97405