

Rosenberg Corey

From: Bob Havard <bhavard@bendbroadband.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 3:25 PM
To: SHS Exhibits
Subject: HB2004-A

To the committee members considering HB2004-A,

I think the proposed BH2004-A is a misdirected short-term bandaid that will ultimately harm tenants as well as landlords by decreasing the availability and livability of affordable rental housing.

I live in Bend and own a few rental properties here. I always keep my rents below fair rental market value. This helps out my renters, and it helps me because my renters typically stay for several years. It's a win-win. I have always known that if my rental expenses, personal health care and/or other living expenses jump up sometime in the future, I could increase rents to help offset those new expenses. With this new legislation, I and other landlords are thinking we should proactively start increasing our rents by the maximum allowable state-mandated rent increase every year to protect ourselves from unexpected future expense increases. How does this help our tenants?

Where rent control has been tried before, it has decreased investor interest in building or owning rental properties. This has lead to less construction of new rentals, to the sale of single family home rentals, and to conversion of some rentals into condominiums that were sold, creating a further shortage of available rentals. Understandably, landlords may defer some maintenance and feel reluctant to make improvements to their rental properties if cash is tighter. How does this help our tenants?

Undermining no-cause evictions will similarly harm tenants. For example, several years ago a male tenant in my friend's duplex was behaving strangely to the woman and child living in the adjoining duplex apartment. For several weeks he played his music loudly at all hours. When she asked him to please lower the volume, he instead turned it up and later began a campaign of staring and sneering at her. Several times he would bang on her bedroom wall late at night. She felt threatened by him, but was afraid to complain to the police. She wanted to move. The landlord asked the male tenant to keep the noise down, but his bad behavior continued. One day when the landlord was speaking with the woman outside her apartment, the male tenant came around the corner and just stared menacingly at both of them. How do you document wall banging and menacing stares in a he said/she said circumstance? My friend used a non-cause eviction notice to remedy the situation, dramatically improving the tenancy for the woman and her child.

But now, as I understand this proposed legislation, my landlord friend would be required to pay thousands of dollars to defray moving costs for evicting this belligerent tenant. Very unfair. How does this help improve the livability for renters in the landlord's duplex? As an analogy, how would your fellow legislators feel if a party guest at their home became obnoxious, but they were required by law to pay for a cab ride plus \$1,000 for their rude guest to stay overnight at an expensive hotel in order to ask him to leave their home? How would their other guests feel if they didn't remove him?

In summary, I believe these two feel-good bills are short-sighted and will ultimately aggravate our current rental housing shortage and harm tenants. Rent controls and attaching punitive relocation costs to no-cause evictions will decrease the availability and livability of rental housing by discouraging the construction of new rental units, increasing the sale by frustrated landlords of existing rental units, discouraging landlord improvements and maintenance to existing rental units, harming good tenants by making it harder for landlords to remove problem tenants. How does this help tenants?

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.

Bob Havard

