

**From:** Lance Mason  
**To:** [SHS Exhibits](#)  
**Subject:** Gimme Shelter -- Where is the balance?  
**Date:** Thursday, May 04, 2017 6:33:35 PM

---

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Oregon Legislature,

Shelter is one of three human needs, along with food and clothing. Urban mobility is rising; for many, renting is not optional, but required. In Oregon's most sought after areas, buying can require years of savings and a sound income. In its urbanized areas, earnings and home prices are often out of balance (any community operating on urban values is "urbanized"). Renting is the only workable option for many who NEED shelter, available at a cost they can and are willing to pay.

Balanced against this need is the supply of livable units/homes fairly priced and maintained for what they provide to the society. If Oregon wants to maintain the very beauty and nature with which it is blessed and it's citizens fight for, then horizontal development and chewing up land can't be a priority. People living within the near confines of ANY community, town or city, keeps the community thriving, not allowing sprawl and its waste of time, space, and resources to define how housing will be created. For this balance to be healthy, rental suppliers must be fairly treated for keeping their rentals in good, livable condition.

All this means that EVERY community NEEDS property owners who supply housing. If they are treated fairly and with respect by their own community, and by the State of Oregon, they will return that respect and keep their city and town rentals in good condition, or lose out to those who do. But if Oregon treats landlords as exploitive opportunists, and punishes them as a group for the sins of a few, and robs them of free choice, then Oregon a) will alienate the suppliers of a valuable service to their communities, b) the towns and cities will degrade, and b) sprawl will flourish.

**Thank you**

Lance Mason  
Email: [lmason@silcom.com](mailto:lmason@silcom.com)

On 5/4/2017 4:28 PM, Gregory Sprague wrote:

it is unfare and unreasonable to take away landlord rights . This will only backfire because instead of creating more rentals it will make it so those who can supply lodging for others will invest their resources in other ways because they can't control their own property. Also, I am a resident in jackson county where we have healthy relationships with landlords and tenants. We should not have to be regimented by Portlands problems and renters complaints. Maybe there should be separate guides according to county instead of a state wide mandate. There are many landlords that are watching to see how these votes will be made, and I would bet that the voting public includes more property owners than renters. You better wake up and not just listen to these renting squeeky wheels who are trying to play the system for as much as they can. signed respectfully, greg sprague, resident of ashland with a rental cottage in my back yard for good people who can't afford to buy a house in ashland.