

My name is Terry Chung, President of the Portland Chinatown History and Museum Foundation, and a member of Old Town Chinatown Community Association.

The Revisions to the 2035 plan that focus on the historic and cultural resources are written in such a way that they significantly weaken the original intent to preserve, save and utilize the designated historic landmarks and historic and conservation districts.

Is the planning bureau listening to the people and community that work and live within the New Chinatown/Japantown Historic District, or just the individuals who seek to develop their properties, while having the taxpayers assist them to make the maximum amount of money. Where is the balanced recognition that those who work and live in the area have an even greater stake in what type of environment they will have to face and work in? Preservation of buildings was identified as one of the top three items that was identified as a need by the Old Town Chinatown Community association. In this new revision, in key places, verbs have been changed from preserve/accentuate/support/Maintain/protect to 'encourage/protect until. This is like going from required to recommended in term of paying your property taxes, or deciding what to do when coming to a stop signal.

Encourage does little or nothing to help in preservation of the city's historic sites if a developer has a plan in mind to maximize his investment return. What you get is the same basic plan for development of each piece of property by each different developer. Removal and new development to the same magnitude of each new building, build to the maximum heights. We already have seen the type of spread of buildings through out other "historic districts" even those that have had no real historical population base. I believe that we already have enough new building of the same design with the same objective, market rate housing.

You've probably all heard the term or song "little boxes". We've seen this approach in the housing developments in the suburbs, and now we're seeing this same approach being proposed as "development" in New Chinatown/Japantown Historic District. We need to protect this district and request and require that the developers work within the height limits established by the National Park Service, to preserve and augment the historic feel and importance of a Historic District.

The spirit of this comprehensive plan should be to maintain and augment the Historic District that is New Chinatown/Japantown. This is Portland's one and only Historic District that still have the potential ability to draw people from all walks of life, with an interest in the history and development of Portland, our city. Once this Historic District is gone, rather than preserve, you've lost your only street front presence to the historic past. No museum, no painting, no exhibit can give you the feel of a time and place, like a preserved environment.

We preserve forest, create parks, create wetlands, create amusement centers, create cultural villages, This plan should maintain and augment one of Portland's last stories of

historical and cultural development.

I've attached a list of comments and recommendations that were passed on to me, that I feel would help make this a better and more significant proposal for Portland's future.

Comments/Recommendations:

- 1) Proposed 2035 language significantly weakens current preservation policy. In key places, verbs changed from 'preserve/accentuate/support /maintain/protect' to 'encourage/protect until' Problematic, undefined qualifiers are added in several places. The strength and spirit of the existing comprehensive plan language should be maintained and enhanced, not diminished. It should be recognized that historic and cultural resources are irreplaceable.
- 2) Proposed policies 4.39, 4.40, 4.41, 4.42, 4.43, 4.44, and 4.45 are good additions and Should be maintained.
- 3) Remove 'statewide' from last sentence of introductory paragraph. Remove the following undefined qualifiers: "high quality" and "where feasible" (4.36) "under-utilized" (4.37) "significant" (4.38)
- 4) Policy 4.38 is especially problematic and should be revised to read: "Protect historic and culturally significant structures from demolition. Where no economically viable use is apparent, allow demolition only after opportunities for public comment and consideration of preservation and mitigation alternatives."
- 5) Replace text of proposed Policies 4.36 with language in existing Objective A. Correspondingly, revise Policy 4.37 to read: "Preserve and complement historic resources when infill development occurs."

Thank you

Terry Chung