

Rosenberg Corey

From: S V BAILEY <wmwarwick@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 2:20 PM
To: SHS Exhibits
Subject: HB 2004-A

I am writing to request a "NO" vote on HB 2004-A. I have been a landlord in Portland for 39 years, and my tenants recommend us to their friends and when they move away from Portland and then return they call us first. My husband and I consider ourselves excellent landlords, and in our 39 years (we now have about 60 units) we have had very few problematic tenants. Fewer than five we evicted through straightforward means: notices for non-payment of rent followed after MONTHS of due process for eviction. There was clear fault in those cases, and while very expensive and frustrating, the end result was achieved. Another was a mental health situation where the tenant's child came out with a gun and threatened other children, the tenant lent her apartment to a friend during the daytime in exchange for ferrying the tenant's daughter to and from school. After chauffeuring duties were completed, he sold drugs from the apartment. Finally - and bizarre behavior on the tenant's part had gone on by this time for several months - she was dancing naked in the parking lot and in the street and - after another process, we participated in having her committed involuntarily. She was hospitalized for many months during which time we were able to re-claim the apartment. Those were the "straightforward" evictions.

The more problematic cases involved tenants whose behaviors were difficult to document as we were not present, but which disturbed, even terrorized, other tenants, and in some cases probably involved mental illness. We got copies of police reports; we talked to all sides; we talked to community resources; we heard counter-accusations; we had good tenants move out. After fully ascertaining that the problem tenant was indeed the problem, we eventually capitalized on repairs needed to the units which would be disruptive. We gave lots of notice. On one or two occasions we were able to move the offending tenant to another unit of ours which did not create opportunities for problems (no one upstairs, for example, who could be disturbed by banging on the ceiling below in response to "telling Satan to leave" or no fireplace to burn Styrofoam, releasing poisonous vapors throughout the building). We ended all such tenancies on good terms with the tenants, but we would NEVER have been able to evict with cause without losing all surrounding tenants first.

I know no-cause evictions can be, and have been abused recently, but in our experience they have provided the only safety net for the landlord who is dealing with a contentious or unstable tenant who falls outside the boundaries of clear bases for eviction. Promises to remedy are easy for a tenant to make, but with some of these tenants, such promises just provide the means to remain in place until all legal resources have been exhausted, in the meantime problem behaviors escalate, bringing down the wrath of the neighborhood as well as the other tenants. The emotional exhaustion for the poor landlord who must remain pleasant so as not to escalate the situation with the problem tenant while trying to placate or resolve problems for the good tenants gets no attention. There is an important role for a means of eviction which does not require blaming the tenant. This is the only one of which I am aware. Please let us keep it in the portfolio of landlord solutions.

Thank you,
Susan Bailey
Baileywick Properties, LLC
503 806-3502

baileywick97212@msn.com