

Submitter: Paul Rudinsky

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Housing and Development

Measure: SB799

Dear Senate Housing and Development Committee,

I am a small apartment owner (68 units, 27 units and 17 units) and truly consider it a privilege to provide a safe, affordable and a quality living experience for our residents. Approximately 60% of our residents in our 68 unit apartment identify as minorities and enjoy the housing we provide. It gives me great pleasure to see how we create safe and beautiful communities in which people live and share their lives together.

I am writing this email in opposition to SB 799, which provides the legal right for a resident to stay in a unit at least 60 days while the resident applies for rent assistance. A similar provision was in place during Covid, and a significant number of residents misused the process and the same will occur with SB 799.

When a similar provision to SB 799 was in place with Covid, we lost a lot of rent resulting in large losses in two of our apartments. More importantly, it created another loophole for dangerous residents to stay in our apartments and thereby diminish the lived-in experience of our residents.

One such resident was walking around naked in the apartment halls asking to have sex with other residents. Another resident was mentally unstable and harassing the residents so that they were regularly complaining about feeling unsafe. These two residents, as well as a significant number of others, used the Covid rental assistance delay as an excuse to stay longer in the unit, did not obtain rental assistance, and damaged the units beyond regular wear and tear. When we attempted to evict them pursuant to a 24-hour eviction, they argued we were trying to circumvent the Covid provision allowing them to stay and seek rent assistance. This resulted in us losing much rent, with many of the residents damaging the units and costing about \$3,000/unit to get the unit marketable again. One such resident cost us over \$40,000 in unit damage through replacing flooring, walls, cabinets, doors, deodorizing, etc., and 6 months in lost revenues as the resident had damaged the unit by keeping 4 non-spayed cats (even though we have rules limiting residents to two spayed cats per unit) in the unit, with their urine soaking in all aspects of the unit.

One would think we would be able to have the foregoing residents evicted under Oregon's 24-hour notice to evict (or 72-hour notice), but in practice we were told such residents did not meet the danger level required by a 24-hour notice standard, and if they did meet the standard it still generally took us more than 60 days to evict

because Oregon's laws are so onerous on landlords.

SB 799 will provide another avenue to be misused and do virtually nothing to ensure that low-income Oregonians have the assistance they need. Our priorities need to be on increased rental assistance and expanding our stock of rental housing supply. SB 799 does not help our low income Oregonians' housing needs and instead is putting another nail in the coffin and driving small apartment owners like me to sell and provide safe, affordable and quality housing in a state that is more balanced than Oregon.

Sincerely,
Paul Rudinsky