

In support of HB 2004-A

Just cause evictions

We equate no-cause evictions to vigilante justice and find very little difference.

No-Cause Evictions share the same impulse a vigilante does in forming mob law. Only this time it's an individual taking away any chance of explanation and redemption of a tenant. No proof, supported only on conjecture and a confused value of punishment drives this.

The question is the value of "due process" which I had thought was the right of all of us. Given the chance to be viewed in a calmer light it is hard to justify the weight of an eviction for a crime the value of a ten dollar parking ticket. Evictions are expensive for tenants both in terms of the cost to move and the stigmatization that accompanies making a new search for logging that much more difficult through lack of references.

Shall we hang those whom we only suspect of an offense. This is how vigilante justice operates. And what impulse does this give rise to but the same. How many punched through walls does it take to see this. I would like to think we lived in a land of laws that prevented all such violence. So please restore respect for due process and the same respect will be returned.

Imagine if everyone decides to take matters in their own hands. I would think chaos would rule the land. But this is exactly what we teach our people when we allow it for landlords but no one else.

As to past and current testimony: After hearing plea after plea on how such an eviction is some act of kindness and consideration for other tenants. So much so it appears orchestrated. Even if true under some circumstances there are better ways to resolve conflicts. But that is not anywhere near dominates its use. Tenants tell me otherwise. Everything from personality conflicts in the landlord/tenant relationship to simply an economic eviction just because the current tenant is tapped out and a new one could pay more.

I did get to read some of the testimony posted and wanted to respond to what I saw as errors in scale. Remembering what Tina Kotex said once in an interview about her justification for the five percent emergency limits. That combined with certain testimony concerning property taxes going up 3% each year impacting costs. One must note that relative to rents collected that this figure must be vastly reduced. Rents are easily 10 to 15 times the property tax. Take 3% divide by 15 reduces actual expense to 0.2%, a minuscule amount far less than the mortgage expense which is fixed and subject to renegotiation to even lower rates. Other expenses such as increased material and labor costs add yet another minuscule amount. This is why other states find only a portion of the consumer price index sufficient to cover these. San Francisco's current allowable increase is 2.2% (last year it was 1.6%). So beware of the misinterpretation.

The other question I have is why no one asks landlords to "open their books?" That would be extremely relevant to all these discussions.

There is a quote from the Baron de Rothschild that states:

"When there's blood on the streets, buy property"

We are bleeding now and wish not to enter into another state of feudalism.

Sincerely, Cliff Gray

Rent Control Now! Oregon

[cgrayrcno@gmail.com](mailto:cgrayrcno@gmail.com)

Sent from my iPad