

**From:**  
**To:** [Exhibits SHOUS](#)  
**Subject:** SB 608  
**Date:** Friday, February 1, 2019 12:56:26 PM

---

As a owner of a small number of apartments and and rental homes in Eugene my wife and I are vehemently opposed to SB 608. For 30 years we have worked hard to provide affordable and decent housing to low income renters. It is a simple question of supply and demand. The answer to affordable housing is more housing. Some of our apartments are next to the University of Oregon campus. In the last 10 years their has been a building surge of campus housing and our vacancy rates have gone up and are apartment pricing have gone down. In the other markets I have studied that have implemented rent control rents are still high and availability of new apartments is low, which appears to be the opposite effect that the lawmakers intended when they implemented rent control.

Please vote no on SB 608.

Also, the recently proposed legislation prohibiting owners from charging a monthly pet fee is horrible. If passed owners would be forced to either ban pets altogether or charge very high damage deposits that would be impossible for most of my renters to pay upfront. One cat or dog can cause \$1000's of dollars in damage to carpets, floors, sub-floors, doors, walls, and the list goes on. The monthly pet fee spreads the cost out over many months. And the tenant can also decide not to have a pet, but if the tenant's pets trash one of my houses or apartments I have to spend money to fix the damage and will lose income while those fixes are being done which can take months to complete.

My wife and I depend on the monthly income from our rentals to pay our mortgage and monthly expenses. SB 608 and the newly talked about pet bill do nothing to address the supply of affordable housing and in fact puts a disincentive in place for us to improve our older apartments.

Sincerely,

Jim Hill

2660 Spring Blvd.

Eugene, OR 97403