

Rosenberg Corey

From: Susan and Marian <susanandmarian@windermere.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2017 1:43 PM
To: SHS Exhibits
Subject: HB 2004-A

We are a real estate office that lists and sells properties, as well as managing rentals, so we see both sides of this issue.

We have found from extensive experience that when a landlord has a good tenant, they desire to keep them, and very frequently do NOT raise rents because they want to keep good tenants. When a no-cause termination is given, it's usually because the tenants have a contentious attitude, are continually tardy paying rent, or they smoke in the premises or have an animal that continues to cause problems with neighbors, despite warnings, or other very good reasons such as illegal drug use (police are reluctant to get involved so documentation is difficult!). My point is that I have not seen either situation mis-used by a landlord. Maybe it sometimes happens in larger areas, but not much in Southern Oregon.

What I have heard from the several landlords I've mentioned HB 2004-A to, is that they would sell their rentals and invest in other States—some have gone shopping, in fact, in Nevada and Tennessee. While we would have a short-term benefit to some extent by representing them as Sellers (in a Seller's market), the renters in this State would definitely not benefit from an exodus of landlords to other States, as it would make rentals even harder to come by, and potentially raise the rate of homelessness in our State. Already, because of the threat of your changes in the law, we have had a lot of landlords in Southern Oregon put their rentals up for sale and the tenants have had nowhere to go (no rentals available). So they get an RV or travel trailer and rent a space monthly at an RV park ... I believe that living in an RV park counts as being homeless. Check it out, it's becoming the only choice for people where rentals are scarce. We need to encourage investors to have rentals. Otherwise, we may be looking at a huge homelessness issue.

Interestingly, we're finding that many renters turn out to be quite capable of purchasing a home, but prefer to rent. If that's the case, is it really wise to protect them from the realities of supply and demand in rentals, so that they never move out of that rental into their own home, just because it's been made so comfortable for them? We personally believe that home ownership is one of the most valuable choices one can make to financially secure their future (as long as you don't take away the benefit of writing off Mortgage Insurance – as we've heard you're also threatening to do – so then what would be the benefit of buying over renting?—the way you're proposing to make the laws perhaps you want the benefit of buying to be so they won't be homeless?). Many young people have told us they are scared, after seeing their parents lose a home in the financial debacle. We've been able to educate them, enabling them to make the decision to purchase their own home, and they're delighted! So we are working hard on our end to help the younger generation secure a home for themselves!

Please do not pass HB 2004-A. There's a reason that a free market thrives where controlled markets fail.

Susan Jaeger and Marian Szewc
Principal Brokers, Licensed in the State of Oregon

211 E Main St, Rogue River, OR 97537

541-582-2000 ofc

541-582-8000 Susan's Cell

541-778-3400 Marian's Cell

SusanandMarian@windermere.com



E-mails sent or received shall neither constitute acceptance of conducting transactions via electronic means nor create a binding contract until and unless a written contract is signed by the parties.