

## Rosenberg Corey

---

**From:** JEANNE DOW <jdow@bendbroadband.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 05, 2017 8:55 AM  
**To:** SHS Exhibits  
**Subject:** HB 2004-A

I am apposed to the bill being considered for limiting landlord control over their rental property. I worked to purchased my rental house, I maintain it, I am responsible for all taxes and I soled bore the legal costs to set it up in an LLC. And if I end up with an "eviction" tenant I will have more legal costs. I have 100% of the responsibility! I do not believe I should have to pay to have tenants move at the end of the lease regardless of the reason I wish to have my property vacated.

And as for the possibility of rent controls, I want to know why Oregon does not tell restaurant owners how much profit they can make on a meal, car dealerships limited to profit per car sold, or gas stations on the profit per gallon of gas. All these items directly affect what people can "afford" yet they are can make a profit for what the market will bare. So why are landlords being treated differently?

I am discussed with the state government's attitude that I have to "provide" something for someone else's benefit. I worked, I earned and I should profit from my rental property.

If tenants want to have control over their living environment more than the current law provides, they should purchase!!! My hard lifetime work should be for my benefit.....not someone else's. The current laws are already a fair balance between landlord and tenant rights.

Don't penalize landlords for the benefit of the tenant. The scale will be heavily weighted in their favor.

Jeanne Dow