

## Rosenberg Corey

---

**From:** Stashu Smaka <stashsmaka@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 02, 2017 2:13 PM  
**To:** SHS Exhibits  
**Subject:** Please vote no on HB2004

- I am 73 year old landlord with only one older home (built 1905) with two apartments. If you are voting yes on anything below please exempt us landlords who own only a single building with 4 apartments or less, we cannot afford the undeserved and onerous tenant entitlement for moving expenses, we cannot recover our repair and renovation costs adequately under rent stabilization or control like larger landlords are able to do, and the [No Cause Termination Notice](#) is essential for the amicable administration of our property and avoiding contention. I can say from 13 years of personal landlord experience with rents of \$367K and operating expenses and improvement costs north of \$300K over my 13 years ownership, that any new expenses you vote in will become rent increases in some way or other.

Viable rental space is a local Portland City problem and its intractability owes much to Portland's bureaucratic inability or political aversion to getting the low income housing it already paid for with tax breaks given to the many developers who reneged on their agreements with the city. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to legislate a way for the city and those recalcitrant developers to honor their commitments.

- **Rent Stabilization is Rent Control**
- Rent Control measures artificially depress rents that in turn fail to improve availability of affordable housing.
- Rent Control's artificially depressed rents discourage the construction of new rental units that are so critical to achieving a balance in our housing market.
- Rent Control stops neighborhood investment. The financial restrictions of Rent Control measures prevent further improvement of rental properties
- Rent Control programs do not target the most vulnerable. Rent Controlled units are equally available to affluent renters rather than those with housing barriers.

### **Vote NO HB 2004**

#### **ELIMINATION OF END OF TENANCY WITHOUT STATED CAUSE NOTICES**

- "Just Cause" vs. "No Cause" terminations is a false dilemma.
- The End of Tenancy without stated cause termination has many functions in Oregon landlord/tenant law. The notice period is 90 days for landlord to tenant, and 30 days for tenant to landlord.
- It is the mechanism that enforces the end of a fixed-term lease
  - Example: A one year fixed term lease is drawing to a close and the without stated cause termination notice is served to remind tenant of the original end date specified on lease.
- For month-to-month tenancies, it allows both parties, either tenant or landlord to end the tenancy.

- Examples: Tenant elects to move, landlord intends to move into property, repair work necessary for unit to be vacated, sale of property, etc.
- **IMPORTANT!** It's also used in limited circumstances to terminate lease violators who present potentially dangerous situations for landlords, tenant and neighbors.
- For Cause (Just Cause) notices are served to tenants to specifically point out violations of the rental agreement allowing cure periods to avoid termination.
  - Examples: Non-payment of rent, unauthorized residents, damage to the property, etc.

Housing providers strongly support maintaining the End of Tenancy without state cause as a critical tool to protect other tenants and property, especially in connection with drug use or other potentially dangerous situations where tenants or managers may not testify against a problem tenant for fear of retaliation.

When without stated cause terminations occur, it's extremely rare. Still, it's a critical tool necessary to manage rental housing.

**Vote NO on HB 2004**

### **RELOCATION PAYMENTS**

- It is not the role of private landlords to subsidize the moving expenses of tenants.
- The relocation payments would be an incredible burden at three times the monthly stated rent.
- Don't follow the city of Portland's strident, ill-conceived policy. Just like the city of Portland, the backers of these bills never consulted the affected industry.
- Relocation payments would be awarded without regard of need. Does the penthouse renter need relocation assistance?
- These untenable policies will prompt owners of rentals to sell which will reduce rental inventory as those homes will likely become owner-occupied.

**Vote NO on HB 2004**

Don't allow property managers and landlords be the scapegoat of Oregon's tight housing market. They play the pivotal role of providing housing to all Oregonians!

Oregon needs more apartments and homes on the market, period. The backers of Rent Control, "Just Cause" arguments and Relocation Payments have good intentions, however their policies will only cause disruption and destabilization of the rental housing market by making operation of rentals more costly and burdensome. Don't incentivize the mass exit of rental homes from the market. These bills still create no new housing, and certainly are not the solutions they're promised to be.



**Stashu Smaka**  
[www.stashusmaka.com](http://www.stashusmaka.com)  
[www.artisanmetalwork.com](http://www.artisanmetalwork.com)  
971-235-6985