

RE:

Proposed Bill _____

Towing per contract.

As a property owner of a small office building in the heart of Eugene, I was quite annoyed to hear of a Bill that would remove my rights as a property owner to implement contracts with sub-contractors. I delegate the removal of trespassing vehicles, drivers who basically steal parking, to a tow company. I might also add that the person who steals parking is also the person who runs over my curbs and poles – same mind-set. I refer to the towed person as the trespasser as they are not a client of my office building, they park and scamper off the premises, they get towed, and they have a hissy fit. They are trespassers; they are not good citizens who need protection. I, the property owner, need protection from them, and contract towing provides me protection without involving the police!

First, I absolutely do not want overnight parking in my office parking lot, and the tow company I contract with removes unwanted vehicles. As a result, I probably have less overall problems that accompany unattended vehicles than other office buildings. The tow company efficiently, and I might add, politely, removes these vehicles providing extra security for myself and my professional tenants. I do not want to get out of bed at 2:30 AM (when bars close) and drive to the office to watch a vehicle being towed from my office lot – that is why the tow driver takes pictures of the vehicle, why be redundant with my presence? My parking lot is 'over-signed' and anyone who parks there is a risk taker, and needs to accept the consequences of trespassing. Also, this Bill would force me to fence my property, at a cost well over \$25,000 – is there a provision in the bill for a 'grant for property owners to fence'. Once my property is fenced I have to pay someone to open and close the gates in a timely manner, does the bill provide a 'security grant' for the property owners?

Frankly, I have to deal with vehicles and clientele that frequent the neighboring business on a daily basis. This problem is on-going as I'm located next to a State of Oregon office, a student housing apartment building, and surrounded by several restaurants. As a result, my parking lot is infringed upon by the neighbor's clientele at least twice a day, seven days a week, in spite of the excellent signage. Asking someone to relocate their vehicle is often met with a hand-gesture, and extremely rude behavior as the person walks off my property to frequent the business, or apartment, next door. Without the back-up of E.V. Towing, and their helpfulness, I would not be able to keep long term professional tenants. My tenant's pay for parking through their rent, they are guaranteed client parking, if this Bill is passed, how can I guarantee parking to my tenants and what rights do I have as a property owner? My tenant's will relocate from my office building to an outlying area. Is that the Bill author's goal -- to encourage business to exit from the city? I have 16 separate business' in the building, all of them lease in this building because of the excellent client parking and a lack of overnight trespassers.


What are you, the Bill's author and supporter, thinking this will solve? My tow company ensures I have proper signage; they ensure that the tow is legitimate; they ensure the costs are reasonable and within the market; they take pictures of the vehicle (per law I might add); and they are polite and helpful to the towed person. My tow company is owned by responsible business people. It is redundant for me to be present at a tow, and would so handicap the towing company to such a degree that I would have no recourse but to fence the property. Also, if I'm present and the person who is towed determines that I'm at fault, I would likely become a victim of bad behavior or violence. Very few people take responsibility for their actions, they blame everyone around them. Has the Bill author determined the possible consequences of an on-site property owner and the possible set-up for break-

ins, violence, or retribution vandalism – because that will likely result if the towee shows up during the tow. At the moment a tow is anonymous – the towee pays for the tow, gets their car back, learns that the tow signs should be heeded. This Bill places me, the property owner, in personal danger.

Towing is expensive for the trespasser, but not outrageously expensive. The trespasser takes a risk, the risk will cost them \$150.00 or more, that was their choice. Why do I, the building owner, have to deal with a tow in person as a law was passed several years ago to take pictures of the vehicle being towed. This new Bill was obviously written to help the trespasser gain access to neighboring property, and deny property owners a mechanism for delegating a job, ie sub-contracting.

What is wrong with my current contract: it serves my professional tenants; it works for me as the property owner; it is incredibly convenient as I do not have to 'guard' my office building 24/7, nor do I have to fence my property holding down costs; the tow company takes pictures and reports the tow to the police; they are reasonable in their pricing; and they indirectly provide security to my building in the middle of the night. I own the property, I have a right to contract with a tow company to tow as needed without having to be on site for the tow. It's a reasonable solution to trespassing without having to call the police constantly.

If there are tow companies who are exceeding their contracts and standard industry pricing, then address the issue with those companies with fines, etc. Otherwise towing contracts are needed by property owners to hold the trespasser responsible for their (repeated) poor choices and limit police intervention. My parking lot would be full of neighboring clientele (especially college students) without a tow contract – it would negatively impact 16 professional businesses.

D.C. Cork 
S. Eugene Professional Plaza
74 E. 18th, Suite #9
Eugene, Or. 97401

3/28/17