

January 30, 2023

Oregon Legislature
To Whom It may concern:
Re: Legislative Proposal SB799

In response to the proposed ordinance to provide renters relief for 60 days and eviction protection, we respectfully submit our objections as stated below.

We are property owners in Eugene. We purchased a house in East Eugene near the University for our son to reside in while a student at U of O. in 2006. We converted it to a rental property when he graduated. We subsequently purchased a second rental property in 2013 with the expressed intent of generating income when we retired.

We are now both recently retired and living on a fixed income. The income generated from these two rental properties is now an essential component of covering our mortgage and living expenses. Therefore, allowing a situation where we have a potential shortfall in income for 2 months would place a financial burden on us as owners.

If the state chooses to provide assistance (subsidies) to tenants who are unable to satisfy their rental housing obligations due to financial hardships or any unforeseen circumstances, this is certainly an option that can be placed on the ballot for the citizenry to vote upon. It is simply not reasonable to expect that the property owners *alone* should shoulder the burden of providing public welfare relief. As with other forms of public assistance, it should be shouldered by ALL taxpayers.

As I mentioned, we feel that this proposed law is arbitrary, unfair, and unsustainable. The property owners will simply be forced to remove their properties from the available rental housing inventory and sell them to avoid being obligated to carry this unreasonable financial burden.

The legislative proposal of requiring the landlords to potentially incur debt to carry the added unforeseen expense of mortgage, utilities, and maintenance for two months on their assets that are supposed to generate income to cover their *own* mortgage and living expenses, is simply unfair. No one is subsidizing the owners, many of whom are retirees.

As seniors on a fixed income this is a financial burden that we would be unable to carry. We are wholly opposed to this proposed law and would ask that you reconsider implementing such discriminatory legislature.

Jan and jeff Scruton
Eugene, Oregon

