

Perhaps the verbiage I found was too simplistic or I'm not looking in the right place for the complete Order, but it seems to have ignored a variety of complex situations that may place the landlord/owner in a more severe situation than his tenant.

My son owns one home, it's in Portland. My son resides in San Francisco and was laid off from his job this month, due to COVID19 orders, and is now on unemployment, trying to pay the high cost of SF rent. On March 1, before the eviction moratorium, he gave Notice to his tenant in Portland, plus a check for 2 months relocation expenses so that he can occupy his home.

My son is ready to move into his home now, to avoid becoming a homeless SF person or being liable for rent he can no longer afford. Is the governor saying that the tenants, whom have already been given notice plus relocation funds can simply pocket the money and continue living in the home with no recourse to evict and/or have an eviction enforced? I'm not suggesting the tenant would do this, but if they are given a legal right to stay so long as the order is in place, it's certainly a strong incentive.

I believe this was short-sighted, as the decision failed to consider that a landlord is also a homeowner, and sometimes this is the ONLY residence the landlord owns. There should be an exemption for people who need to occupy their home. They should have the basic right to obtain shelter at the place they worked their entire lives for. And the authority should continue to carry out such evictions to protect the health and wellbeing of the homeowner. Everyone is not a wealthy businessperson who owns multiple investment properties.

Thank you in advance for sharing this scenario with your committee. I'm sure there are hundreds of similar situations out there.

Lynn Heisler