

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, July 17, 2008
Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Council President), Kathryn Harrington, Robert Liberty, Rex Burkholder, Rod Park, Carl Hosticka, Carlotta Collette

Councilors Absent:

Council President Bragdon convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:01 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Patty Unfred, Public Affairs and Government Relations Department, explained the new changes in the chamber.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

3. INTEGRATING HABITAT PEOPLE'S CHOICE AWARD VIDEO

Council President Bragdon introduced the video, by saying that we had a tie for the Integrating Habitats People's Choice Award student winner in Category 2-Commercial development and lowland hardwood habitat: The first winner was: "Designing Flow" From: Pennsylvania State University State College, Pa. Congratulations to: Brett Nagy, "The Green Spine: Backbone of a new commercial commons" From: University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz. Congratulations to team members: Laura Bolyard, Kimberly Creagan, Rachel Hill, Jenny Leijonhufvud and Steven Steinberg.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

4.1 Consideration of minutes of the June 26, 2008 Regular Council Meeting.

4.2 **Resolution No. 08-3958**, For the Purpose of Approving an Application For Easement to the City of Tigard For the Realignment of a Failing Sewer Line Through Metro Property.

Motion:

Councilor Burkholder moved to adopt the meeting minutes of the June 26, 2008 Regular Metro Council and Resolution No. 08-3958.

Vote:

Councilors Burkholder, Harrington, Liberty, Park, Collette, Hosticka and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.

5. ORDINANCES – SECOND READING

5.1 **Ordinance No. 07-1162A**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, 2008-2018 Update.

Council President Bragdon indicated this ordinance had already been moved and seconded.

Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 07-1162A. No one came forward. Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Councilor Harrington provided comments about the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP). This was for adoption of the 10-year plan. Metro had a long-standing role in solid waste management planning. This plan had been underway for several years. There had been recent amendments to the plan as noted in the companion ordinance. Final action was under consideration at the July 24, 2008 Council meeting.

5.2 **Ordinance No. 08-1183A**, For the Purpose of Amending Metro Code Title V, Solid Waste, to Add Chapter 5.10, Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, to Implement the Requirements of the 2008-2018 Regional Solid Waste Management Plan (RSWMP).

Council President Bragdon indicated that this ordinance had already been moved and seconded previously.

Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 08-1183A. No one came forward. Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Councilor Harrington said this ordinance was to implement the requirements of RSWMP. There was an "A" version because of the changes to the ordinance having to do with compliance.

6. RESOLUTIONS

6.1 **Resolution No. 08-3960A**, For the Purpose of Endorsing the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Columbia River Crossing Project and Amending the Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Plan with Conditions.

Motion:	Councilor Burkholder moved to adopt Resolution No. 08-3960A.
Seconded:	Councilor Park seconded the motion

Councilor Burkholder introduced the resolution. He explained the "A" version, which included the changes that Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) made. He summarized the changes. Richard Brandman, Deputy Planning Director, walked through the decision process. He said the resolution did three things; adopted a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA), amended the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and expressed a list of concerns and consideration that the Metro Council had about the project. He provided a history of the proposed project. He noted the resolution's "be it resolves". He also noted Exhibit A, which covered the list of concerns about the project. He also noted amendments to the RTP.

Jason Tell, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 1 Manager said this project had no shortage of public input. There had been over 12,000 comments received. He noted the importance of the Metro Council in this decision. He talked about opportunities for this project, which included environmental, economic, sustainability, and a demand management emphasis. They had been commended on their multimodal approach to the project. The project would also stimulate the economy. The resolution would allow the project to proceed. He spoke of collaboration within the region. He thanked the Council and Metro staff for their commitment to the work that had happened so far.

Councilor Harrington said she had continued to field emails particularly on the topic of tolling. She asked Mr. Tell about tolling. Mr. Tell said tolling had changed over the years. Now people would purchase a gantry, which you put on your car and were scanned, rather than using a traditional toll booth for collection of the toll. They would be going with advanced technology.

Council President Bragdon asked if ODOT looked at tolling as a demand manage and a revenue gather piece. Mr. Tell said yes. Council President Bragdon asked if ODOT could make a solid case that this project would get state support and not over burden the region. Mr. Tell said this project had both state and federal impacts. Chair Ackerman talked about freight movement, which went through Portland. Council President Bragdon asked about influences that local government had with regard to this project. If there was serious reservation, how would that be viewed by the federal government? Mr. Tell said he would think the project would not move forward without regional support. Council President Bragdon asked Mr. Brandman about land use patterns and Metro's capability to evaluate land use impacts. Mr. Brandman said Metro does have the capability to evaluate land use impacts.

Councilor Collette asked them to talk about regional project funding if we were going to the state and the federal government for funding as well as the impact on other project funding. Mr. Tell said the project was on such as scale that it rises to a different level. Councilor Collette clarified that the question was about funding. If there was limited funding dollars, how did this project scale as compared to other projects? Mr. Tell said because of the significance of the project, he felt funding would move forward and not impact other projects at the federal level. On the state side, no proposed package had come forward but tolling would help impact that funding discussion. Mr. Brandman added that with respect to specifics on the light rail issue, there were two proposed projects Milwaukie to Portland light rail and Columbia River Crossing light rail. They were already having discussions about funding these two light rail projects. They were having discussions both in Washington DC and Seattle. Councilor Hosticka asked about putting it in the financially constrained list and what that meant. Mr. Brandman responded to his question. He further explained the federally constrained list of projects and what would move forward which included modeling. Councilor Hosticka said if he voted on this resolution he believed this project funding was reasonable. Mr. Brandman talked about anticipated revenues for the project. Mr. Tell said this would allow receipt of funds.

Councilor Hosticka asked about tolling credits. Mr. Brandman explained the credit program. Councilor Hosticka said a couple of weeks ago they had had a discussion about the state funding package which proposed raising the gas tax by \$.14. Mr. Tell said there was no package on the table at this time. Councilor Hosticka asked about the need for additional funding. Mr. Tell talked about modernization projects and proposed funding. Mr. Brandman clarified that the \$.14 was not specific to any projects yet. There was an understanding that the state's share would be out of the state package. Mr. Tell said all of the projects were being looked at and what kind of phasing could occur depended upon the project.

Councilor Park said the good thing they did was to look at a system approach. He wondered about tolling of I-205 and the impacts. He said looking at this in terms of the future and studying the system, what were the impacts of tolling? Mr. Tell said there would be a bit of diversion for the I-205 corridor but there was such a demand on the I-5 corridor, he didn't believe there would be that great of an impact.

Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 08-3960A.

Edward Banner, Former State Transportation Commission, WSDOT, 4009 NE 50th Avenue Vancouver, WA 98661 said when this project comes together he hoped that all of the governments maximize this opportunity to move forward. It was a great project. It was needed for the economy.

Terry Parker, P.O. Box 13503, Portland, OR, 97213 provided his testimony for the record.

Jeff Swanson, Schnitzer Steel Industries, 3209 NW Yeon, Portland OR 97210 provided his testimony for the record.

Larry Epstein, Diversified Marine, c/o Welkin Engineering 7165 SW Fir Loop #204 Tigard, OR 97223 provided his testimony for the record.

Kathryn Williams, Port of Portland, 121 NW Everett, Portland OR 97209 said she was the Rail and Business Affairs Manager. They reiterated their support for bike-pedestrian, light rail and tolling. Marine Drive was a very critical access for freight movement. She thanked Councilor Park for his question about tolling on I-205.

Marion Haynes, Portland Business Alliance, 520 SW Yamhill Suite 1000 Portland OR 97204 said the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) was the Alliance's number one priority. Oregon's economy was highly freight dependent. The CRC was recognized as one of the worst bottleneck in the corridor. This was a forward thinking project. She detailed benefits of the project. She urged support.

Fred Nussbaum, 6510 SW Barnes Rd Portland OR 97225 said there were concerns raised about air quality and faulty assumptions. The selection of a LPA was premature. He urged remanding the LPA back to reanalyze the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). He felt DEIS was faulty. He urged slowing down and doing the right thing. This resolution addressed two separate items.

Jim Howell, 3325 NE 45th Ave Portland OR 97213 provided his testimony for the record.

Ronald Buel, 2817 NE 19th Portland OR 97212 provided his testimony for the record.

Mara Gross, Coalition for a Livable Future, 107 SE Washington #239, Portland OR 97214 provided her testimony for the record.

Corky Collier, Columbia Corridor Association, 6015 NE 80th Portland OR 97218 said there were a number of questions that still needed to be resolved. He encouraged anyone who had questions, to come to the working group. He explained what you got with this project. We can make a statement about this region with this project.

Scott Swaren, 1543 SE Umatilla St Portland OR 97202 said Mr. Tell from ODOT stated that this was a fix. He talked about other bottlenecks in the area such as the I-405 loop. He wondered if this constituted a new corridor not a fix. He felt there was something more in the mix. He addressed freight rail connections.

David Johnston, 15918 NE 41st Vancouver WA 98682 felt the new bridge would be an improvement to what now exists and would improve the economy.

Walter Valenta, CRC, PO Box 17127 Portland OR 97217 said by lifting the bridge, it would help develop a compact complete community in the downtown Vancouver area. He also talked about improvements to Hayden Island and Marine Drive. He spoke to land use benefits

Rick Rush, 3202 S. 2nd Way Ridgefield, WA said he supported a replacement bridge with light rail, three through lanes with one arterial lane. He urged no tolling. They needed to work cooperatively and bring the cities together. He proposed the bridge be paid for with federal dollars.

Sharon Nasset, 1113 N Baldwin Portland OR said she hadn't heard a good reason to go forward with the LPA. She talked about funding for new starts and appropriations. She noted an article that she had provided to the Council. She said to go forward without answers, was not appropriate. She noted organizations that opposed going forward.

Tom Buchele, PEAC 3324 SE 13th Portland OR 97202 said he appreciated the fact that Metro had drafted a better resolution than other government entities. They had some problems with the resolution. They should be asking for a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). He continued to be disappointed about through and auxiliary lanes.

Joe Cortright, 1424 NE Knott St Portland OR 97212 said he supported Metro and the work that it does. He was disappointed about how Metro had proceeded with the process. He talked about Metro's concerns. He felt the process had been flawed. He urged a SDEIS and more public input.

Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Councilor Liberty said he understood that Jason Tell testified. He wondered if Mr. Tell had addressed the issues of tolling on other bridge. Mr. Tell said he had addressed this issue.

Motion to amend:	Councilor Harrington moved to amend Resolution No. 08-3960A, Exhibit A, section C and Exhibit C by changing the word "or" to "and".
Seconded:	Councilor Collette seconded the motion

Councilor Harrington explained her amendment. She wanted to ensure as the project moved forward that they think outside of the box and not with just specific technologies. She trusted that the project team understood this. Council President Bragdon supported her amendment. He noted that JPACT had approved this resolution. He wondered whether this had to go back to JPACT. Dan Cooper, Metro Attorney, said he did not think it had to go back to JPACT. Councilor Park asked about the effects on I-205 with this change in language. Councilor Burkholder said the action they were taking was the LPA for the DEIS which focused on the I-5 bridge but there was recognition that there were impacts to other areas. Mr. Cooper agreed with Councilor

Burkholder's summary of the project. This language was limited to the I-5 corridor. Councilor Liberty said the last time he offered several amendments, which failed. In general his interest in offering amendments was waning but felt this amendment was useful. Councilor Harrington said the resolution they passed previously had the word "and". She urged support.

Vote to amend:	Councilors Park, Burkholder, Collette, Harrington, Liberty, Hosticka and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
----------------	---

Motion to amend:	Councilor Collette moved to amend Resolution No. 08-3960A by adding a sentence in Be it Resolved #3 which said Metro will invite review and public input.
Seconded:	Councilor Hosticka seconded the motion

Councilor Collette said she was concerned about the information brought forward by CLF about public involvement. She further explained the amendment. Councilor Burkholder asked if this was a substantive change and would this have to go back to JPACT? Mr. Cooper said it would not have to go back to JPACT. Councilor Harrington clarified the amendment. Councilor Burkholder said it was the sponsoring agencies who were responsible for the public involvement because we were not the owners and operators of the project. Council President Bragdon said they were supportive of this language. He talked about the degree of alignment with City of Portland and hoped that we would work in collaboration with the city. Councilor Collette said this was a public process and we should continue to seek input from the public as the project moved forward.

Vote to amend:	Councilors Park, Burkholder, Collette, Harrington, Liberty, Hosticka and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 7 aye, the motion passed.
----------------	---

Councilor Hosticka wondered if this resolution passed today was the RTP permanently amended and that if we didn't support the project moving forward would they have to re-amend RTP? Mr. Brandman responded that this would amend the RTP. It put the project into the RTP but did not definitively define the project. There were many steps to go through that would determine if the project would move further. Mr. Cooper added his comments about amending the RTP and the necessary process. Councilor Liberty said the RTP looked like two lists, projects and policies. He noted an amendment he had made that failed having to do with RTP policies. Mr. Cooper said the federal RTP was the piece that was being amended. The state RTP was different. Ultimately, on this project you would have to demonstrate policy compliance. Councilor Liberty said when they made the amendments in November 2007 it was to the federal RTP. Was it consistent with the policies adopted for the federal RTP? Second, on the state part of the RTP, staff had indicated in this resolution that they wanted to use the legislation passed in 1994 for south north light rail as a way of approving the freeway component. That had criteria that were not the same as criteria applied to other land use decisions. Now he was not clear whether or not they were going to use that statute for the new replacement bridge? Mr. Cooper said the Land Use Final Order (LUFO) process which the resolution referred to which comes back to Council does have separate criteria. RTP compliance was not a part of those criteria. The Milwaukie light rail LUFO required that the LUFO was consistent with the RTP policies and other Framework Plan policies. It was an option for the Council to take in the LUFO process if Council wanted add that additional criteria as Council's own filter before Council went forward with the LUFO. Legally under the 1994 statute, the LUFO does not require RTP compliance but in Council's judgment, it could be added.

Mr. Cooper said the relationship of the federal RTP to an appeals process was not one he was familiar with.

Councilor Park asked if we didn't approve this resolution, acting in their MPO position, would they be able to use federal funds to continue to study the project? Mr. Brandman said if they did not approve the RTP amendments to bring this project into the fiscally constrained federal RTP, the project could not proceed.

Council President Bragdon asked what the meaning of fiscally constrained, if we didn't know the funding mechanism to pay for the project. Mr. Brandman said there were many projects that were incorporated in the federal RTP and the determination was made as the plan was assembled on what was the actual cost of the projects that were listed in the plan itself. The plan being a 25-year document contains lots of projects that were in various stages of project definition so for many of the projects there was no conceptual engineering. There may only be a line on a map. There was a cost estimate associated with that. In this instance there is an EIS which has a cost that was associated with the degree of engineering that had taken place on the project to date and a cost associated with the project as it was currently defined. The Federal Highway Administration would look at the totality of the plan and they will make a judgment whether the many assumptions that were continued in the RTP for revenue growth over a 25-year time frame were correct and match the multitude of the project costs. He spoke of financial assumptions. The test that the federal agencies will use in the particular instance was; were the assumptions reasonable as they were presented in this plan. Council President Bragdon said this was analogous to where they were with the Milwaukie light rail. Mr. Brandman concurred with his statement.

Councilor Hosticka said he was still struggling with this. They were constantly hearing that the data was flawed. If all they were doing was approving an LPA he might be willing to consider it. If what we were doing was to make a statement about our willingness to amend our own RTP to include light rail and tolling, he could support this. He talked about a phased approach. However, at 12 plus lane-bridge as a replacement was not susceptible to build in phases. He could not support the resolution today.

Councilor Liberty said he supported something that was cheaper, smarter and greener and parts of which this Council had expressed support for which was to toll the existing bridges. The existing bridges were in fair condition as rated by the ODOT, which was the same condition as the Markham Bridge and better condition than 30 other bridges on I-5. These were important public assets paid for by the public and represent a lot of energy and materials that we shouldn't throw away out of respect for tax payers and the environment. He would toll existing bridges and make those bridges safer and rebuild the interchanges, which cause accidents and congestion. He also supported building a local bridge to Hayden Island with light rail and bike-pedestrian access to allow local residents to avoid I-5. The bridge could be extended which would be the supplemental bridge with light rail. He also looked at the down stream rail bridge, which needed to be improved so that barge traffic can go through high spans and possibility commuter rail service. He would look to widening I-205 to six lanes and toll this bridge giving preferential treatment to freight, transit and high occupancy vehicles. He felt this fit Metro's goals, pocket book and ethos. He felt this is a very expensive investment in one small piece of the region's infrastructure. He said we made these decisions in isolation instead of looking at a range projects and investment to find out what was best for the community, taxpayer and the environment. He also talked about funding. He was worried about other projects falling off the table as this project was put at the top of the list. He said our first priority should be fixing what we have. He felt there was only a 50-50

chance of this project going forward. He had heard a lot of ideas and had offered his own idea. He felt they would be back to have a future conversation.

Councilor Park thanked Councilor Burkholder for his effort. He had gone to great lengths to voice the concerns of the Council. He noted some of those concerns. He noted that this was not a final decision but the beginning of the process. He felt it was a prudent decision to move forward.

Councilor Harrington said she was disturbed by some of the comments of her colleagues. She felt the resolution that was before Council supported the Council's intent.

Councilor Collette said there were still a number of questions that had been raised such as impact of health and wellbeing of our community. As a Council we had asked for independent reviews as we move forward. They wanted answers in a public forum. Her biggest concern was with the sponsoring council. She said she was concerned about the public involvement. She will support this motion because we needed to get to the answers and build a real green project.

Councilor Burkholder said it was always a difficult issue to take on this type of a project because of the costs. He noted that most of their colleagues had voted in support of moving forward. This was a critical issue for the nation. This was a critical link, which was aging and failing. He also said this was a huge opportunity for light rail linkage. This was also an opportunity to create a bridge that was flexible and adaptable. There was also an opportunity where this was one of the few projects where they could talk about self-financing. When people used something they should pay for it. Using tolling to pay for the bridge would help change the demand equation and help fund the project. There was more work to do and a lot of more analysis had to be taken. He had been supportive of this and felt it was a positive contribution to the livability of the region. It was our duty to move forward.

Vote on Main Motion:

Councilors Park, Burkholder, Collette, Harrington and Council President Bragdon voted in support of the motion. The vote was 5 aye/2 nay, the motion passed with Councilors Hosticka and Liberty voting no.

7. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATION

Michael Jordan, COO, said Council President and he had attended a meeting with AFSCME to talk about health care. They would be talking about how a steering committee could be formed to talk about this issue. He would be meeting in one-on-one meetings with Councilors before the August 8th, he would be talking about the Sustainable Metro Initiative.

8. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor Park talked about a walking ability survey, where Metro scored as number 10.

Councilor Burkholder said he went to Salem to talk about issues related to transportation. The key issue was what to do with the counties that received timber revenue which were now gone. He spoke of the challenges of assisting the counties without bankrupting other communities.

Councilor Liberty said the Milwaukie City Council approved the LPA for the Milwaukie light rail project. Next week this resolution would be before the Metro Council.

9. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Council President Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:18 p.m.

Prepared by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Billington". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
JULY 17, 2008**

Item	Topic	Doc. Date	Document Description	Doc. Number
6.2	Letter	06/27/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Ginger Metcalf, Identity Clark County RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-01
6.2	Letter	06/30/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Oregon AFSCME RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-02
6.2	E-mail	06/22/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Thomas Reindel RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-03
6.2	E-mail	06/16/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Carrie Lynn Moylan RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-04
6.2	E-mail	06/27/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Lloyd Rash, Radio Cab Board RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-05
6.2	E-mail	06/16/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Martha Goetsch, MD RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-06
6.2	E-mail	06/13/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Norman Hamilton RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-07
6.2	E-mail	06/16/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Chris McKnight RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-08
6.2	E-mail	06/17/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jill Neill RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-09
6.2	E-mail	06/16/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Michael & Carol Conner RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-10
6.2	E-mail	06/16/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Danielle Murphy RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-11
6.2	Letter	06/26/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Beth Quartarolo, Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-12
6.2	E-mail	June 2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Sharon Lee, Nick Engelfried, Stacey S. Williams, Tanya Stokes, Michael Krumper, J.D. Adams, Marilyn Mullanix, Amy e. Rivero, Arran E. Thompson, Rosemond Graham, Mauria	071708C-13

			McClay, Doug Dodge, Jordan Epstein, Mark Seibold, Rosemary Forester, Alan Collins, Dave Kaplowe, Cathy Zheutlin RE: Columbia River Crossing- UNPRECEDENTED OPPORTUNITY-MULTIPLE DATES	
6.2	E-mail	06/09/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Michael Ossar RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-14
6.2	E-mail	06/09/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Charles K. Johnson RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-15
6.2	E-mail	06/07/2008	TO: Amy Cortese FROM: David Bragdon RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-16
6.2	E-mail	06/13/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jennifer Starr RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-17
6.2	E-mail with 2 articles attached on freeway pollution	06/12/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Linda A. George RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-18
6.2	Letter & 2 maps	06/11/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Walter Evans, III, Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-19
6.2	Press release	06/06/2008	TO: Public FROM: Jon Coney RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-20
6.2	E-mail	06/26/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Judy Todd RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-21
6.2	E-mail	06/08/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Amy Ponteri RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-22
6.2	E-mail	06/30/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Gerald Fox RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-23
6.2	E-mail	06/30/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Leslie Sawyer, Bridgeton Nbrhd Assn RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-24
6.2	E-mail with attached article by Jeffrey Rubin of CIBC	06/26/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Barnaby Willett RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-25

	World Markets			
6.2	Letter	07/03/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jantzen Beach Moorage Board of Directors & Membership RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-26
6.2	Letter: regarding DEIS response letter	06/30/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: HINooN RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-27
6.2	Letter: regarding DEIS response letter	06/28/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Michelle Tworoger RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-28
6.2	E-mail	07/07/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Richard M. Waldron RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-29
6.2	E-mail	07/07/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Gary Maculsay RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-30
6.2	E-mail	07/07/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Bob Koski RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-31
6.2	E-mail	07/03/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Rand Schenck RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-32
6.2	Email with attached comment on DEIS	06/30/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Gerald Fox RE: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-33
6.2	Email with attached comment on DEIS, dated 6/24/2008	07/03/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Rod Merrick, Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-34
6.2	E-mail	06/16/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Walt Mintkeski RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-35
6.2	E-mail	06/30/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Leslie Sawyer, Bridgeton Neighborhood Association RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-36
6.2	Memorandum to sponsor agencies	07/03/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Doug Ficco, John Osborn, Columbia River Crossing RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-37
6.2	E-mail	07/08/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Thomas Grossman RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-38

6.2	E-mail	07/08/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jennifer Jasatis RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-39
6.2	E-mail	07/08/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Judith Alef RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-40
6.2	E-mail	07/08/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Evan Smith RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-41
6.2	E-mail response re: EPA letter	07/13/2008	TO: Jason Tell, ODOT FROM: Carlotta Collette RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-42
6.2	E-mail response re: Align the CRC proposal	07/13/2008	TO: Jennifer Stager FROM: Rex Burkholder RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-43
6.2	E-mail response to 71708c.42r	07/14/2008	TO: Carlotta Collette FROM: Jason Tell, ODOT RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-44
6.2	Introductory memo to Memorandum and CD of: Preliminary Comment Report for the Draft EIS Public and Agency Comment Period; May 2 to July 1, 2008	7/03/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Columbia River Crossing Task Force RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-45
6.2	Memo regarding CRC	07/14/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Larry Epstein, DMI RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-46
6.2	Draft TESTIMONY on CRC	07/17/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Larry Epstein, DMI RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-47
6.2	Email RE CRC	07/14/2008	TO: Rex Burkholder FROM: Larry Epstein, DMI RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-48
6.2	Email RE CRC	07/14/2008	TO: Larry Epstein, DMI FROM: Rex Burkholder RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-49
6.2	Email RE CRC	07/15/2008	TO: Councilors Park, Collette & Harrington FROM: Larry Epstein, DMI	71708c-50
6.2	Memo cover and letter	07/10/2008	FROM: Dave Frei ,Community and Environmental Justice Group	71708c-51

	dated 07/01/2008, CEJC Letter to CRC and Sponsor Agencies		TO: Metro Council RE: Columbia River Crossing	
6.2	Email	07/16/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Caitlin Porter RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-52
6.2	Email	07/17/2008	TO: Metro Council FROM: Sylvia Thompson RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-53
6.2	Letter with 11X17 artwork	07/12/2008	TO: Rex Burkholder FROM: Angela Danadjieva RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-54
6.2	Email RE:CRC	7/16/08	TO: Larry Epstein, DMI FROM: Rex Burkholder RE: Columbia River Crossing	71708c-55
6.2	Testimony	7/17/08	To: Metro Council From: Mara Gross, Coalition for a Livable Future Re: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-56
6.2	Testimony	7/17/08	To: Metro Council From: Terry Parker Re: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-57
6.2	Testimony	7/17/08	To: Metro Council From: Jeff Swanson Re: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-58
6.2	Testimony	7/17/08	To: Metro Council From: Larry Epstein Re: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-59
6.2	Testimony	7/17/08	To: Metro Council From: Jim Howell Re: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-60
6.2	Testimony	7/17/08	To: Metro Council From: Ron Buel Re: Columbia River Crossing	071708c-61
6.2	Article and cartoon	7/17/08	To: Metro Council From: Sharon Nasset Re: Article and Cartoon on the Columbia River Crossing from the Columbian	071708c-62