

Barry Berkowitz

#267677 | March 15, 2021

Testimony to **Portland City Council** on the **Shelter to Housing Continuum Project, Recommended Draft**

If a bond issue for a park, or a donated land agreement, contained use stipulations then it would be incumbent on the organization proposing any change to said agreement to get approval from the original source before unilaterally modifying its terms & conditions (unilaterally breaking the agreement). So if a bond was approved by a vote then the voters should have to be the ones to agree to any amended terms. If the land was donated then the original donor or estate would have to agree to amend the terms, even temporarily. Saying something is "temporary for 180 days" does not meet any terms of the original agreement. Realistically, a park is intended for the peaceful use of the public for a certain quality of life activities. Turning a part of the park into a 24/7 camping ground would likely remove the perceived quality of life for many of the regular users who depend on that space for its atmosphere ... families with children, senior citizens, local working adults, etc. So to assist a few you are willing to diminish the peace of the many who paid to live in that neighborhood and expect their government to protect their rights, not come up with reasoning and/or language to take them away.

Testimony is presented without formatting.