

Rosenberg Corey

From: Thia <bellthia@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2017 8:56 AM
To: SHS Exhibits
Cc: ld@oregonrha.com; ROA
Subject: Opposing HB 2004 A

Dear Legislators,

Please find other ways than this blanket mandate on all landlords of more than four units.

Many small landlords actually have other priorities than maximizing potential profits as quickly as possible.

And this could hurt more tenants than help.

I did not speak or write against this before, but am compelled to beg for the little old landlady now, and for other struggling tenants who may never face eviction but who will pay more to offset these mandates

Our family has meticulously maintained two rental homes in Lane County for 70 years and never raised the rent while they are occupied, or evicted a single tenant. One tenant stayed 11 years before saving up enough to buy her own home.

We are allowed to add more units on these large lots and have been looking at granny flats and tiny homes, partly to reduce grounds care costs as well as offering more affordable housing options in lovely, near-private settings in west Eugene.

Yet the prospect of HB 2004-A passing is a nightmare of 24/7 worry what kind of prolonged or retaliatory damages could occur for months, not only to our property but the impacts on other tenants, the neighbors, and even our personal safety, if we would be required to state explicit causes for terminating our "month-to-month" agreements and in other timelines than presently allowed.

This bill also could force small landlords to lose already marginal income (after high maintenance costs and property taxes, etc.) by having to hire property managers to run the clock and mouting paper mill needed to deliver more violation notices and all the steps required to build the case, and follow through for few units.

Not to mention even more extensive screening and vetting up front, and higher deposits to ward off the landlord impacts of HB 2004, which would also make it harder on house hunters to get through our tighter gates.

So far, we have not had to hire other managers and are able to vet and respond immediately to all renters' repair requests and discuss issues without issuing more violation notices that might stay in their file, jog managers' or my memories and potentially affect reference queries for years to come.

We keep the large damage deposits strictly untouched in a separate account until they move, as renters can leave in even less than 30 days to start a 31-day clock to return their deposit when no other rent may be coming in. We tuck away another \$4,000 each year for the rental property taxes alone, and another \$4,000 for sudden emergency repairs (i.e over \$1,500 needed for ice storm tree damage alone each recent year. \$4,000 for new sewer lines last year, \$3,000 for new furnace in Jan.) None of this fund includes on-going maintenance costs that come out of monthly rents.

We have absolutely no way to tap this deposit or emergency fund or other sources should we be required to reimburse 1-3 months rent for a missed step if a termination was deemed necessary. Except by letting repairs wait while collecting new rent, eventually.

Retaliation from a stated cause for termination is still my major worry. We live only a mile away, but have long relied on the goodwill and patience of the neighboring owner-occupiers to keep us informed of activities we cannot personally monitor.

I believe stating cause could put the neighbors in jeopardy. Troublesome tenants usually know or may wildly and wrongly guess who reported their specific actions that might prompt us to terminate our month-to-month agreement.

When the tenants sign up, they must only give 30 days notice to move when they want to go. No reason is needed from them to leave.

It was agreed when they moved in that this goes both ways. For longer than the first six months.

Although we only have two rentals now --so HB 2004 would not currently apply until easily changed at any time to below 5 units-- our nice family homes are on double lots. We have long considered adding granny flats and/or tiny homes to provide more options for students, seniors and others needing more affordable homes with less landscape upkeep for them and us. This plan is pending until the current tenants decide to leave on their own.

Our rents are at least \$200 below current market now in quiet, safe areas only two miles from the city center. We do this to offset the high water bills and hose-moving time needed to maintain heritage plants, fruit trees, and big lawns during the long summer drought months. We provide mowing and all other grounds care.

Our renters also request, develop and maintain personal vegetable gardens and enjoy the large fenced yards now for their children and pets. They would still have yards, gardens, fences and fruit trees if more units were added.

If this passes, however, our rents will go up immediately as soon as legally possible on five current tenants-- four hard-working and one disabled, all in their third year of tenancy ---- for the first time in 70 years the rent has been raised while occupied. I do not want to do this to them. They might even be forced to leave their gardens, give up their dogs and move to less desirable areas of town or farther from their jobs that two actually bike to now.

We might just nix the tiny home plan, and simply let the 12-story developers swallow our skylines and families with no place to raise healthier, happier kids or organic food in toxic towers while we tearfully watch our few ladder trucks struggle to respond to any quake or inferno.

We have used the we word here only for safety reasons. Oregon-born, and recently retired with no other income than these rentals, we foresee many adverse impacts personally and socially in this beloved community and throughout this innovative state.

Surely other ways can be found than this Draconian blanket approach. We all know how low the blanket could be amended to spread at any time.

It really scares me to give cause for a "month-to-month." If the renters need more security, they can sign year leases elsewhere. Their desire for a flexible moving date for no reason requires the same trade-off.

Please nix HB 2004 A, and any Senate bill with its same language.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Bell, et al
2655 Taylor St
Eugene, OR 97405