

Rosenberg Corey

From: Zak Modrell <zak_modrell@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2017 3:25 PM
To: SHS Exhibits
Subject: opposed to HB 2004-A, here's why...

1. Too Complex. For those who don't want to take things to court, this will lead to bad landlord/tenant relationships because somebody is going to feel like they might be getting screwed. The rules are way too complicated. Currently a lease is a contract with clear terms and a clear expiration. I have read HB-2004-A several times now and I don't think I understand all that is in there and, more importantly, there is information that seems to be missing. For instance when a lease is not renewed, either because the landlord did not extend an offer to renew or the tenant did not accept, does the resulting month-to-month arrangement happen under the same terms as the preceding lease (same monthly payment)? If so, then that is a too-easy way for tenants to lock in a rate and keep it indefinitely while the landlord loses the security of a lease (among other things).

2. More generally, this bill is a patch. It is clearly intended to be matched with some form of rent control. It is a one half of a solution that enables the other half, but we don't have visibility into that other half. Supporting this bill is blindly supporting some greater and undisclosed (or as-yet unknown) scheme.

3. These are market forces at work here. There are not enough rental properties. Stripping property owners of their rights to enable tenants to stay in a property does not mean that more people will have access to housing. At best it means that those who do get in will have a little more security (depending on the rent control part of the scheme), but those who don't get in still don't have anyplace to live. At worst, and I believe this to be a serious risk, the number of available rental units will decrease - especially in the single family residence market - because people like me will sell their properties and seek out other investments.

We don't need to 'do something', we need to do something that will work. Make more land available, zone that land for multifamily use. Don't make this complicated. It is supply and demand. HB-2004-A will not increase the supply or reduce the demand. It is not a solution.

Zak Modrell
541-420-1304
Deschutes County rental property owner