

Dear Committee Chair Jama, Vice Chair Linthicum, and Senators Anderson, Golden, & Patterson,

As a licensed Property Manager, I see some serious problems with the proposed amendment to SB 282:

- 1) Extending the grace period for non-payment of back rent until February of 2022 would just extend the pain being felt by property owners. All of my clients are older and depend on their rental income for retirement. The current situation has brought a few of them to the brink of losing their property, and this extension could push them over the edge. It would also not help tenants, but instead would just delay the inevitable need to pay back-owed rent. It is time for Oregon to start moving toward recovery, not further extending the pain already inflicted by the pandemic.
- 2) Prohibiting Housing Providers from considering any evictions from the Moratorium periods when screening applicants will make it nearly impossible to effectively screen applicants. This is because almost no tenants were evicted during the moratorium except a few For-Cause evictions of truly egregious residents. We need to be able to screen for these rare but problematic tenants, or it will hurt our businesses by saddling us with destructive and dangerous residents.
- 3) Abolishing time limits and quantity limits on guests would create the disturbing situation of having large numbers of un-screened pseudo-tenants effectively squatting in homes and apartments. For example, in Corvallis, where we have a large student population, this would likely result in a single student renting a room or an apartment, then allowing "guests," i.e. several other students, to live with them for the school year. In Corvallis, we have many houses with five rooms that are rented to a total of five students (one per room); this legislation would result in those houses having 10 or 15, or perhaps even more, residents. This kind of situation is dangerous and unhealthy for the tenants, hard on the property, and hard on the neighbors. Besides the headaches this will cause for property owners and managers, it will likely become a nuisance and drain on police services as well. Of course, the example of students extends much to the rest of the community. Creating uncontrolled increases in density will not solve Oregon's homelessness problem.

This amendment appears to be aimed at helping dense, urban areas with large numbers of low-income folks. It may well serve those areas well, and I encourage county and city-level policymakers to explore these options. However, the State of Oregon is not homogenous, and the rules proposed in this amendment would be harmful and counterproductive to low-density and rural areas.

Additionally, this proposed amendment was added at the last minute, which is never how public policy should be made, especially far-reaching policy such as the proposed amendment to SB 282. Allowing the amendment to SB 282 is rewarding bad behavior; please oppose it.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Alex Wilkens
Corvallis