Rosenberg Corey

From:	Lynn Schmorl <lynnhouses4u@comcast.net></lynnhouses4u@comcast.net>
Sent:	Wednesday, May 03, 2017 5:23 AM
То:	SHS Exhibits
Subject:	HB2004. VOTE NO

Dear Senators,

<u>Tenants already have the right of protection from terminating month to month without cause by</u> choosing to rent with a lease only vs. month to month. Tenants choose month to month because of the benefits to them. <u>HB 2004 discriminates against the landlord</u>. In Portland, the tenant only has to give 30 days notice while the landlord must give 90 days if the tenant has occupied the required time. A tenant's 30 day notice creates the cost, to the landlord, of a vacancy (usually a month's rent) as well as the painting of the interior as required by the City of Portland. <u>Do not ignore all the TENANT benefits/protections in the</u> month to month rental agreement. There are no penalties to the tenant if they choose to give notice to vacate in the first a month of tenancy.

Being a landlord requires a large commitment of money and time. Costs go up every year--insurance, property taxes, water/sewer, garbage, electricity, maintaining the buildings and grounds, and many more costs. My time spent a month on the 4-plex rental property I own is an average of 30-40 hours a month. Like most landlords in Oregon, I fit in the demographic of owning 4 or less rentals. Like many landlords, I own the rentals due my husband and I making financial sacrifices and working long hours for decades. It is not my responsibility to subsidize a tenant's rent. I support low income rent subsidies from the counties and the state.

The two times I terminated tenancy without cause was to the <u>benefit</u> of the tenants. Both had multiple notices of noncompliance of the rental agreement as well as multiple late rent payments. Their record looked much better having the tenancy terminated without cause vs. termination due to noncompliance. Both times, cost for repairing the rental unit to the state it was in when rented was over \$7500 each time. The common thread of lack of respect for the use of the property is a factor in the rising cost of rents.

Over the years, legislation has again and again passed bills to benefit the tenant. HB2400 is very biased toward the tenant. My tenants all drive vehicles that are worth more than \$30k when purchased, all have Internet and cable tv, all have smart phones, take vacations that require traveling; they have good income(s). Yet, these tenants are treated, by elected representatives, as if they are financially strapped.

It would be more fair to all to increase rental assistance to low income tenants. The last time I checked, the waiting list time for section 8 in Clackamas and Multnomah counties was well over a year. The increased rental cost to tenants is due to multiple costs increases from multiple sources. It is simplistic to blame only landlords for the increased costs leading to increased rents. It is biased to change the month to month rental contract to penalize a landlord when the tenant is allowed to terminate the contract without cause.

The shortage of rental units was predictable years ago when a flood of foreclosures of residences and rental properties created a need for more rentals while decreasing the number of rentals. Government has not performed as promised regarding building low income housing. The local real estate market has experienced increased property values. The purchase price of rental property directly impacts rent costs. A percentage of the value of rental property to a potential buyer is based upon the rental income. To restrict the freedom of a property owner to manage their investment will result in fewer rental units.

The impact of even more restricting of the freedom to manage one's rental property will be more current landlords will choose other options like selling their rentals and purchasing in another state with laws that are not biased against landlords and/or turning month to month rentals into short term rentals. (Since Portland imposed the punitive penalty for termination without cause, I have been investigating property prices, rental income and rental laws in other states. I am also investigating short term rental options as my income would increase, I would have better access to keep the units in impeccable condition, and there would not be the various tenant personalities to deal with.)

Again, I urge you to vote against HB2400 because tenants already have protection by simply choosing to rent with a lease only. (The current laws give tenants much flexibility to break a lease with little or no penalty. A rental lease in Oregon is a flexible document for the tenant only.)

Sincerely, Lynn Schmorl 1435 SE 130 AV Portland 97233 503-516-4309

Sent from my iPad