

To Whom It May Concern,

I want to express my opposition to this Senate Bill 282. This bill does not take renter nor homeowner's full interest into consideration. My opposition is mainly for the following items:

- Prohibits Housing Providers from considering non-payment history or any evictions from the Moratorium periods when screening applicants

--It is essential for housing providers to learn about one's eviction and non-payment history, just as how mortgage companies require applicants to disclose credit history with all related information provided. The State should not be in a place to prevent transparency in transactions. Without knowing this information, housing providers are not being protected and especially for individuals who are renting their owned homes out to those who are in the market looking. Renters are not the ones PAYING property taxes to the state/city but home owners do. If legislation continues to loosen regulation for the screening portion, home owners will suffer and hence due to the fear of possibly renting the property to someone with unknown previous renting history, home owners will likely hike up the rent and deposit amount to deter those who have less resources available on hand, which will likely create an even more unequitable rental market with rent and deposit increases.

- Prohibits Housing Providers to evict on Housing Provider's occupancy standards if lower than the amount required by Federal, State or Local law or regulations. Assumes that any eviction from a housing provider to a tenant with past due balance is retaliation. --In the world of law enforcement and political practices, it is universally held with the idea of "presumption of innocence". If that's the practice our nation upholds to the highest level, why at the state level are we allowing it otherwise? This to me is nothing but a proven case of the senate committee being double standard. What a shame to see a rule or principle which is unfairly applied in different ways to different people or groups. This is discrimination against housing providers.

- Abolishes time limits on tenant's "guests" and how many "guests" a tenant can have

--The property belongs to the housing provider/property owner. Rules are set in place for those who have the user right to follow. If the tenant wants to have 10+ guests, they can try to find a property that allows. It's the tenant's freedom to have as many guests as they want BUT why are we not respecting the property owner's will? Property owner also has the freedom to set up rules for dwellers who choose to abide the rules. If the senate committee chooses to overlook the will of property owners and insists on abolishing these commonly agreed on rules, property owners will again highly likely use the "pricing out" method to exclude a large group of potential tenants.

I see no sustainable benefits with all the items mentioned above. Oregon already has a very tight rental market with many trying to secure properties that are well maintained, and affordable. They do not support tenants in the long run, neglect the housing provider group, and intensify the divide between housing providers and tenants. The senate committee needs to at least consult people from all groups, share results and reasoning before making these proposals. It's disheartening to see public servants whom we support using taxing dollars to come up with legislature items that are so out of sight.

Yours,
Isabell