

15 March 2021

To: House Committee on Housing

Re: House Bill 2364

Dear Chair Representative Fahey, Vice-Chairs Representatives Campos and Morgan, and members of the Committee:

Why is this further intrusion into the private property rights of rental property owners needed? Is it because they are providing housing to those that need it? Do sponsors of this bill think rental property owners haven't been dealt quite enough blows yet?

Have tenants not been favored enough yet? Just what is a tenant's fair share of what a property owner has worked for anyway?

Why do tenants require first refusal to purchase a house? Is it to minimize the benefits an owner might enjoy if other, and better, offers are pending? And why do the sponsors of this bill believe that tenants aren't already given a purchase option and so this legislation is necessary?

There are no more tenants than there are rental providers. Are rental properties standing vacant? Why are benefits to tenants flowing out of the legislature like water through a sieve while getting any benefits to rental property owners is like pulling teeth? Where is the currently much ballyhooed *equity* in this picture?

If the sponsors of this bill are rejecting the idea of citizens being left to handle their own affairs due to humankind's fallibility and/or moral weakness, they must for the same reason reject every kind of government action they've come up with. But of course they do not, and hold themselves superior to the average person.

This legislation is not needed. This legislation is driving more wedges between rental housing providers and tenants.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Richard Wisner". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Richard Wisner