

James Hamilton
3910 SE 134th ave
Portland, Oregon 97236

To Whom it may concern:

I am emailing you today with my concerns with Portland's comprehensive plan. With a little research I was able to find some concerns with housing cost, transportation issues and over all government spending.

A lot of cities that have implemented similar plans have had issues with the cost of housing being so high. Unable to afford a house people then have to live in high density apartments. In 1989, the National Association of Home Builders rated Portland one of the 50 most affordable housing markets in the county, but since 1996, Portland has ranked among the five least affordable housing markets due to Portland's urban-growth boundaries which have led to a sevenfold increase in land prices. Now living in apartments most of my life, I can say that its not bad. However, people should still be able to have their houses and yards so their children can have a place to play safely. I believe that these neighborhoods provide a better future for Oregonians than living in high density apartments.

We all know that over time cities grow due to more people living in the area. Metro, Portland's regional government, is predicting a 75% increase in population by the year 2040, but only increase highway capacity by no more then 13%. This is going to lead to more congestion on our roadways and highways. Even though Portland has light rail and other public transportation, only 3% of all trips in 1990 were done by transit and or by bicycle. Metro predicts that by 2040 only 6% of all trips will be by transit and having 88% by automobiles. I have noticed first hand that streets are getting more narrow, more bike lanes being added, but congestion is slowly getting worse.

My final issue is cost and government spending of said planning. Portland spends 2 million dollars a year on making speed bumps, eliminating turn lanes on major streets and reducing traffic lanes. Portland seems to be promoting congestion in order to get more people to use light rail and other public transportation. Let us not forget that Portland has all ready spent 65 million dollars on the planning of the new I-5 bridge without ever moving a pile of dirt.

In conclusion the proposed land use change may not be the ideal change Portland needs, and with Portland's record of poor cost management on said projects, is this beneficial? Are we just taxing ourselves to a Los Angeles style Portland area? Not as Portlanders, but as Oregonians WE deserve better than this.

Sincerely,

James Hamilton
Rahaine007@gmail.com