

From: [Stephen Onisko](#)
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: CRC EIS and Recommendations
Date: Monday, June 23, 2008 12:49:16 PM
Attachments:

Sir:

I take issue with your proposed recommendation to support the construction of a replacement bridge as a preferred option. I recom^{ment}ed that you support the no build option for the following reasons:

First off there is the cost of such a monumental undertaking, the largest in this region's history. Much of the \$4.2 billion cost of this project will be shouldered by people like me whether as a fuel tax, tolls or some debt instrument. In my opinion these costs are based on some very doubtful and extremely speculative projections given today's economic and environmental uncertainties. For example the current gas crisis, the faltering economy, the mortgage crisis, unemployment, inflation and the huge national and personal debts that will call into play not only the cost of borrowing money, but the ability to pay it off. I believe that these factors have a far more negative role on your recommendation than is presented in the Draft EIS. Thus, as a possible payer for part of these huge sums, I recommend that the economic factors and analysis be reviewed and updated to reflect present trends and realities, and that concrete proposals be made that will describe exactly where the monies will come from and how they will be repaid. I want to know what my obligations are! In addition I believe that vehicular trips since the fuel crisis have fallen and will continue to fall significantly from what is projected and that this is a truer representation and should be the basis for your recommendation. These projections will support a no build option.

I truly believe that Portland is a livable city and I want it to remain as such. It was through community action and political debate that the city has instituted land use

laws in keeping with the State's directives. As a livable city I am more than happy to put out the welcome mat and invite those who want to live, work and enjoy our wonderful city. However, with the recommendation, we will only accommodate urban sprawl to the detriment of our city. Oregon chose to diminish urban sprawl and all of the evils associated with it, especially the use of the automobile, a necessity for suburban living which is the chosen lifestyle in Clark County. Those who choose that life style should bear their own costs, but please, please do not push those costs onto our livable city. It is Portland and neighborhoods like mine which will bear the brunt. As stated in the Oregonian (May 18, 2008) "Clark County commuters are the primary cause of the congestion and the primary beneficiaries of the project." Quite simply the bulk of the benefits are given to the Clark County commuters while the brunt of the costs, such as land use, air quality, noise, safety and health related problems, are born by Oregonians.

Stephen Onisko
3744 N. Overlook Blvd.
Portland, OR 97227

The other season of giving begins 6/24/08. Check out the i'm Talkathon. [Check it out!](#)